

APR 9 1908

0

TERMS—\$2.50 a year, in advance.

75 cents per copy.

EDITOR, LUTHERAN QUARTERLY
TILLYN FOUNDATION

THE 462700

LUTHERAN QUARTERLY

CONDUCTED BY

JAS. W. RICHARD, D.D., LL.D.

J. A. SINGMASTER, D.D.

FREDERICK G. GOTWALD, D.D.

WITH THE SPECIAL CO-OPERATION OF

PROF. S. A. ORT, D.D., LL.D.

PROF. F. D. ALTMAN, D.D.

PROF. ALFRED HILLER, D.D.

PROF. F. P. MANHART, D.D.

PROF. J. L. NEVE, D.D.

VOL. XXXVIII.—NO. 2.

APRIL, 1908.

Entered at the Gettysburg Post-office as second-class matter.
GETTYSBURG, PA.

COMPILER PRINT
1908

CONTENTS

| ARTICLE | PAGE |
|--|-------------------|
| I. REALITY, BY THEO. B. STORK. | 167 |
| II. MOTIVES, BY CHARLES W. SUPER, PH.D., LL.D. | 168 |
| III. THE OLD FAITH BUT A MODERN THEOLOGY, BY G. U. WENNER, D.D. | 175 |
| IV. MODERN ACQUISITIONS FOR THE INTERPRE- TATION OF THE BIBLE, BY REV. J. F. SEEBACH, A.M. | 185 |
| V. THE BIBLICAL DOCTRINE OF THE HEART, BY NORMAN S. WOLF, B.D. | 197 |
| VI. ON THE DOCTRINE OF SCRIPTURE AND INSPI- RATION, BY REV. W. A. LAMBERT, B.A. | 210 |
| VII. THE NEW THEOLOGY, BY PROFESSOR JOHN O. EVJEN, PH.D. | 224 |
| VIII. THE MAKING OF THE MINISTER: A SYM- POSIUM, I. BY JACOB A. CLUTZ, D.D. II. BY PROFESSOR M. COOVER, D.D. III. BY PROFESSOR F. P. MANHART, D.D. | 235 248 252 |
| IX. MODERN THEOLOGY, BY REV. AUGUSTUS SPIECKERMANN. | 258 |
| X. THE IMPECCABILITY OF CHRIST, BY PROFESSOR J. A. SINGMASTER, D.D. | 266 |
| XI. SPENER AND HIS INFLUENCE, BY REV. HENRY ANSTADT, A.M. | 275 |
| XII. REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE, | 284 |

The Creed of Jesus—Epochs in the Life of Jesus—Canon and Text of the New Testament—The History of Babylonia and Assyria—A Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels—The Inward Light—The Christ that is to be—The Evolution of Love—Positive Preaching and Modern Mind—The Law and the Gospel of Labor—The Lord of Glory.

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY.

APRIL, 1908.

ARTICLE I.

REALITY.

BY THEO. B. STORK.

And so illustrating the statement made at the outset of a previous paper* that space and time are crucial tests of philosophic discussion we are brought face to face with that great problem. What is reality? A problem that we have incidentally touched upon more than once in the course of our approach.

This much has already been made evident: space and time do not apply to reality but only to thought and perception, to the Egoistic activities dealing with reality. They thus discover themselves to be one of the minor criteria of that much disputed point, what is and how shall we know reality. By this we are shown what reality must be and that simple consciousness without thought and perception alone of all conditions known to us excludes space and time, and so in this respect answers the description of reality. By simple consciousness is meant consciousness without, what Hegel calls, self-relation, consciousness unmodified by any activity of the Ego, made up of sense-impressions of the external world and of feelings making up and constituting conscious existence of the Ego.

The moment these contents of the simple consciousness are taken up and modified by the activity of the Ego, reality ceases, space and time appear as necessary to the making the processes

(*) Published in LUTHERAN QUARTERLY, October, 1907.

of thought and perception intelligible. The knowledge of reality is immediately lost for thoughts and perceptions being self-confessedly representative of something other than themselves thereby in terms admit their want of reality and so stand self-condemned. Then emerges the question heretofore absurd as applied to a simple consciousness composed of only sense-impressions and feelings: are these perceptions correct? These thoughts are they true? Reality consisting of simple consciousness is of course true: it is itself, represents nothing; and the question of truth is inapplicable; for truth or want of truth of anything must always mean does something which purports to be a copy, replica or representation of another correctly report correspond or agree with it. I cannot ask, is my sense-impression, my sensation, true, as well might I ask is my consciousness which is constituted by them true. And so another important criterion of reality is given us. It is not representative of anything. It is directly known, which is simply another way of stating that it represents nothing, but is simply itself, for itself, purporting to have no relation to anything else as a copy or an effect. Having the sensation (not observe knowing either it or that I have it) is direct knowledge of it as part of myself. I am the sensation in so far as it with other sense-impressions goes to makeup my consciousness and so constitutes a mode of being of myself. It is I: I am it. This is the only direct knowledge possible to me. When I suffer agony that agony is part of myself, a mode of my existence, representing nothing I know it directly and I cannot doubt its truth. It represents nothing and so there is nothing with which I can compare it and test its truth. To question its reality is to question my own for it is myself. Again as contrasted with reality thus conceived, I observe that I have control over my thoughts and in a less degree over my perceptions as for example and especially in dreams. My will can cause them to appear or disappear. I may accept or reject them or modify them and shift them about and do much as I will with them. This I know intuitively, I cannot do with reality. In it I recognize as one of its distinguishing marks something not myself in the sense that I cannot control it or do as I will with it yet something which in another sense is myself in that it is even against my will and

beyond my control part of myself a mode of my existence as a conscious Ego. An agony of pain, one sort of reality, is myself, constitutes for the time my whole consciousness, excluding every other content and yet it is not my will, is entirely beyond my control. I can neither exclude nor modify it by an act of volition. Thus reality appears in its true light a mysterious union of the Ego with the Non-Ego—one of the many mysteries of consciousness—inexplicable yet beyond all doubt real. The Non-Ego thus given is as real as the Ego, the knowledge of it is as real unquestionable, and direct, i. e. I know it directly and know that it is not under my control (although part of myself) which is the definition in terms of consciousness of the Non-Ego. It also is a criterion of reality for there is no reality without this element of Non-Ego which is never subject to my will although I am part of it and it a part of me; for the truth of reality lies in this consciousness of both Ego and Non-Ego unmodified by perception or thought. All these statements are direct deliverances of consciousness impossible of other proof or of doubt.

We have, therefore, gathered together all the criteria of reality. In order of importance they may be stated as follows: Reality is distinguished, first, as something directly known, not representative of anything, being in some way we cannot explain a part of the Ego itself, a determination of its conscious existence.

For what we know directly cannot represent anything, direct knowledge of anything must be *ipso facto* the thing itself, the reality, not a representation of it, for that would be indirect knowledge. Secondly, it is something beyond the control of the Ego's will, it has in other words always present in it an element of Non-Ego, when this disappears or is absent we have instinctively a feeling of unreality. The absence of this element at once causes us to suspect the reality of whatever is thus deficient; for we know that we cannot control, or make, or unmake reality or change it even; although in a sense a part of ourselves, it yet defies us and remains independent of our will. Thirdly, the element of Ego is as essential as that of Non-Ego: a reality of which we are not a part is so far as we are concerned non-existent: a reality without consciousness or beyond it, external to it, is impossible to our thinking. The various difficulties of this position are well known. It will be asked on the one side: Does

the Non-Ego appear and disappear with consciousness? Do the eternal stars only shine for me? Has the world no reality beyond me and my individual consciousness? If so, what becomes of them when I am absent? Does my coming re-create them? Will my death annihilate them? Such a position strikes the ordinary plain man as incredible. He declares he must think the Non-Ego, the stars, the world as reality, independent of the consciousness, of his existence. What he is conscious of, the sense-impressions that are known to him as part of himself in consciousness must have something back of them that is independent altogether of that consciousness. This is a necessity of his thinking. But on the other side, it must be asked: what sort of a reality must that be existing out of consciousness? Is it not something formed simply under the coercion of a law of thinking which carries no warrant of its validity beyond mere thinking? Is it not a delusion of the mind, this something that is out of consciousness, that exists unknown, under conditions that never can be known, whose very existence is posited expressly to be independent and apart from the only condition, consciousness, under which any knowledge is possible to us? If consciousness and reality are not one what kind of reality can that be which is not known, has no existence in consciousness? Such reality thus inferred must be a different reality from the known reality: the only known reality is that of which the Ego is an essential part. In this reality being and knowing are identical, the Ego is, and it is, because it is conscious of itself and of that other not itself. Is there any absurdity of thinking wilder than this insisting on a reality which is by its express terms posited as unknowable, i. e., as out of consciousness, as having qualities different from any ever revealed to us in experience, i. e., without any of the effects on consciousness by which we know all that we do know. Is not this more absurd than the absurdest theory of the Idealists?

We launch ourselves into fairy land when we endeavor to construct such reality, an enterprise more idealistic than the most ideal philosopher ever dared and far more useless; for what is more vain and unprofitable than a speculation as to what sort of a world that may be which no man is ever to see, which is posited as unseeable, unknowable, but graced by a sort of arbitrary

tour de force of the intellect with the supreme quality of being the only reality!

To declare that because certain effects are known to us, are reality, that therefore certain causes must exist behind them different yet more real, although utterly unknowable as such, is to claim for the law of thinking, causality, a validity utterly unwarranted. Fourthly, it may be added that Space and Time do not apply to reality. This being, however, rather a consequence of the previous qualification that it is not representative of anything, that is, it is neither thought nor perception. In short reality is just what every man without reflection upon consequences and consistencies of thought accepts as such. What each man feels directly, his simple consciousness of himself and that something not himself, unmodified by thought, uncolored by the perceptive faculties. He knows this reality without a doubt of its truth: as well might he ask if he himself were true: for this reality is himself and he is it.

When thought enters and separates the reality of consciousness into Ego and Non-Ego and, constructing representations of them, undertakes to think them, reality is lost and contradictions and difficulties appear.

Some philosophers have actually gone so far as to make the laws of thought, of the representative criteria of the represented, the reality. Thus the law of contradiction has been erected as one of the criteria of reality. (1) Upon which Kant aptly remarks: "Realities (as simple affirmations) never logically contradict each other is a proposition perfectly true respecting the relation of conceptions but whether as regards nature or things in themselves (of which we have not the slightest conception) is without any the least meaning. For real opposition in which A-B is—O exists everywhere, an opposition in which one reality united with another in the same subject annihilates the effect of the other." (2) Or to put it a little differently it is merely a law of our thinking that reality as we must think it contains no contradictions: this does not justify the assertion that reality in itself is in perfect agreement and harmony, but only that our conceptions of it must be. The proposition means no more than

(1) Bradley's *Appearance & Reality*.

(2) *Critique of Pure Reason*. Amphiboly of Conceptions of Reflection.

that a conception containing only affirmatives contains no negatives. (3)

We cannot think reality. All our thinking is done confessedly with the representative not the real, with the image, the idea, the symbol of the real. It has already been shown how much this image, idea or symbol differs often intentionally from the real which it represents. It is only by that process of more or less abstract representation of reality that it becomes possible to apply those laws of thought which are constantly employed with results that are practically correct and satisfactory for our everyday transactions. It is for example only of these abstract representations that we can assert the truth of the logical rule: "Things that are equal to the same things are equal to each other:" for we know that two things in reality never are exactly equal. Logic does not deal and cannot deal with reality but only with these representations of it, all of which have at their root and as the very beginning of the abstracting and representative process that primary act of abstraction by which Ego and Non-Ego united in consciousness as reality are torn apart, violently divorced from each other and separately turned into independent representations of the Ego and Non-Ego and so thought.

Let us examine how reality disappears as the representative abstraction made from it loses either of these two essential elements. In order to think we have seen that we must have our representations under our control, must exclude that element of the Non-Ego in them which forbids this.

But as we exclude the Non-Ego and shape our representation more and more after our own will, the sense of reality disappears and the representation approaches what is sometimes called the fantastic, the fanciful, the unreal. As long as there remains in the representation something that is beyond our control, something not ourselves, retaining that is traces of the Non-Ego, that particular something is accredited intuitively with truth, correspondence with reality. If every trace of the Non-Ego be excluded consciousness itself disappears; for even self-consciousness is without reality save as the self is distinguished from the not-self whose presence in consciousness is thus made essential

(3) Paraphrased from Kant's Critique (Amphiboly of Conceptions of Reflection) p. 180.

for the reality of the self. Without the Non-Ego consciousness of the Ego would be impossible. In the phenomena known as dreaming this element of reality which we call the Non-Ego and whose distinctive characteristic mark is its refusal of all control by the will of the Ego may be advantageously studied. For in dreaming it seems as if these two essentials of reality were present. Dreaming apparently combines for us the Ego and Non-Ego as completely as waking consciousness. But the Non-Ego of which we are there made aware is but the representation of the Non-Ego, the image of our thinking, not the reality of consciousness, not the sense-impression of simple consciousness. It is a Non-Ego lacking the essential mark of the true Non-Ego, the refusal to be the creature of the Ego. The Non-Ego, of dreams is controlled by the Ego which turns and shifts it at will into fantastic shapes and combinations whereas the Non-Ego of reality refuses to yield to such manipulation, is independent of Egoistic control and so a true Non-Ego. Frequently in the dream we are not aware of this: the Non-Ego behaves like a true Non-Ego, apparently beyond our control, until on waking we find it disappears with the Egoistic condition thus revealing itself as the mere creature of the Ego's volition, not independent, but a mere manufacture of the memory and imagination. If it be objected, as it might with some acuteness, that in dreams there is a consciousness of the self which is a reality as far as it goes, that is to say in my dreams I have always a consciousness of myself which is real although the consciousness of the Non-Ego is not real but only imaginary, recollected, and that in dreams self-consciousness seems possible, therefore, without any Non-Ego to make it so, the answer is not difficult that there is an element of Non-Ego still remaining in dreams, a residue, remembered and reproduced from the storehouse of memory and sufficient to constitute that contrast necessary to make a reality of self-consciousness. For it is sufficient to make a consciousness of self real to have some content, something in consciousness derived from the Non-Ego originally, ideas, representations of the Non-Ego are sufficient for this; so that we can imagine a man cut off from all communication with the world of Non-Ego having however a consciousness filled with ideas or representations of former sense-impressions who would

have as real a consciousness of himself as if in the constant receipt of actual present sense-impressions. A man without, however, any memory of such and without any actual sense-impressions would have no consciousness of anything and therefore no self-consciousness, confirming our doctrine that with absolutely no Non-Ego nor any trace of memory of it there would be no self-consciousness, nor in fact any consciousness at all.

If on the other hand we separate, as we may in thought, that other element of reality the Ego from the Non-Ego and endeavor to make a representation of a Non-Ego without any Ego to be conscious of it, we shall find such representation even according to the laws of thinking, of logic, self-contradictory and illusive. For it is an attempt to think in terms of consciousness a Non-Ego only known by and in those very terms of consciousness which we in thinking seek to separate arbitrarily from it. We must think the Non-Ego if we think it at all as it is alone given to us originally, in consciousness, that is as part of the Ego which is its reality, i. e., as having certain effects on the Ego. And again, the test of all Non-Egoistic reality is in its last analysis an Egoistic test: without the Ego you can never know that there is a real Non-Ego, since the essence of all the Non-Ego as known in reality is its refusal to yield itself to the will of the Ego. In its truth, its reality, the Non-Ego exists as a negative of the Ego, a setting up of something contradictory thereto. It is, as it were, a shadow of the Ego which disappears with the disappearance of the Ego. its substance. In other words, to put it in everyday language of the street we know that there is an outside world solely and only by its antagonism to our own Ego, to our own volition. Everything that stands out against ourselves, that refuses to be governed by our will, we know to be a something else—an other. When in doubt, when we hesitate whether we ought to consider that any given thing (Non-Ego) really is or is not, we make this the test. If it resists our will, exhibits independence of our control, then we consider the questioned reality a true reality but if we find that we can control it, or alter it, if it simply answers to our will we unhesitatingly reject it as an illusion created in part or altogether by ourselves and therefore not a true Non-Ego since it lacks that essential

quality of the Non-Ego, a resistance to and independence of the Ego.

It has already been remarked that it is only by getting rid of the element of Non-Ego to a greater or less extent that thinking as such becomes possible. For that essential characteristic of the Non-Ego its self-will refusing to yield to the will of the Ego—by which the Ego knows it for what it is, something different from, negative of, itself and its will—forbids thinking. The essential of thinking is the complete control of the Ego over it so that all the material of thought is absolutely at the will of the Ego to recall, modify, dismiss as the process of thinking requires. As an activity of the Ego it absolutely demands full unhampered control of its subjects excluding the Non-Ego so far as that element refuses to yield itself to the will of the Ego. In so far as the Non-Ego furnishes material for ideas, thoughts, symbols, the instruments of the thinking process it is in this sense a constituent of all thinking and necessarily so but only in that representative shape which is amenable to the will of the Ego and so capable of being thought as the Non-Ego of reality cannot be.

That is to say, there is in every idea, thought, symbol, no matter how artificially fashioned by the Ego's activity, a something beyond its control as Ego, an element of Non-Ego, something represented which could not have been derived from the Ego.

Thus it is plain that reality cannot be thought, the very effort to make it the object of thought by representing it in ideas, thoughts, symbols, destroys it by expelling of necessity the element of Non-Ego and so all thought ostensibly about reality is illusion. In short, thought of which we boast so proudly is an evidence and symptom of the weakness and imperfection of our human faculties of knowledge. It is a result of our inability to know directly and at once all that is to be known. It is an attempt by the Ego to remedy those inevitable and natural defects of our faculties which compel us to know only the present and to perceive only indirectly. It is a makeshift by which representation is substituted for reality to patch out the imperfect knowledge of it that alone is vouchsafed us. For why do we think and for what object? Is not the object of all thinking to complete for the Ego by means of comparisons and judgments a picture of the universe? In thought we strive to see as though

by a single act of perception—precisely as if the whole were in our consciousness—the universe, with all its relations each part to the other, the most minute atom as well as the most gigantic fixed star, just as the whole really is, that is as it must appear if we could perceive it all at once, completely.

If we had this power, thinking would then be superseded, no longer necessary, for we should perceive and know directly all things which now we seek to gain a knowledge of by the imperfection of thought. Perfect knowledge driveth out thought.

We should then live in a perpetual present of reality and time would be no more. There would be no past nor future. Such a condition steadily regarded will appear less fantastic than perhaps it may at first seem. It is naturally more or less difficult to attempt to think with our present faculties of perception and thought, what and how we might know if they were enlarged or changed. But it is possible to conceive even with our present limited faculties, how all sense of time might disappear, so that there should be neither past nor future. The Scriptures tell us of God's existence in those remarkable words that strike down our sense of time so bewilderingly, proclaiming for Him a perpetual unalterable present without past or future: "Before Abraham was, I am." (4) Abraham's past was God's present, that is to say to a being with greater than human capacities the distinctions of time disappeared: Everything was present to that enlarged faculty, that consciousness which had the capacity to retain all impressions exactly as presented and to embrace them in their totality, the universe, with all its details small and great. Then to such a consciousness there could be no past for it would never let go into forgetfulness or even dimness of recollection that which once had been its possession, neither would there be any future; for a consciousness which possessed perfect and unabridged knowledge of all the universe in its completeness could never suffer the experience of any changes or new thing; for it would in the completeness of its knowledge have these and all their possibilities of change—which make the future of our consciousness—in its present possession. And so may be faintly understood the mysterious words of Scripture:

(4) St. John's Gospel, VIII: 58.

"There should be Time no longer," (5) for the fulness of knowledge possible to God and perhaps to men in a different state will thus destroy it. (6) And so eternity is revealed not as an endless succession of changes which are impossible to our thinking but as a perpetual present that has no changes because it embraces and includes them all in a present that never changes. For changes are only possible to a consciousness possessing imperfect and incomplete knowledge by reason of which some new hitherto unknown thing comes into consciousness and so makes what we call future: for of course we even now only know the present and both past and future are simply Egoistical creations of our thinking, the past a remembered present, the future an imagined past, built up from remembrances.

A consciousness that embraced all things in their totality, an omniscient consciousness which might not be what we call consciousness at all but its equivalent with the capacity for all knowledge bestowed upon it could thus have no past and it would have no future for nothing new, i. e., no change, could be added to what was already all embracing and comprehensive of the totality.

(5) Revelation X: 6.

(6) Daniel Webster in his "Confession of Faith," written in 1867, referring to this subject of time and our human limited conceptions founded upon it, adopts the view outlined in the text as satisfying his own mind upon the point:

"I believe that things past, present and to come are all equally present in the mind of the Deity: that with him there is no succession of time nor ideas, that therefore the relative terms past, present and future as used among men cannot with strict propriety be applied to Deity."

He finds here too a solution of that endless puzzle of our thinking—God's foreknowledge and man's free will; for he adds:

"I believe in the doctrine of foreknowledge and predestination as thus expounded. I do not believe in those doctrines as imposing any fatality or necessity on men's actions or in any way infringing free agency."

ARTICLE II.

MOTIVES.

BY CHARLES W. SUPER, PH.D., LL.D.

The problem of free will and its antithesis, determinism, has engaged the attention of thinkers ever since man became a self-conscious being in ancient Greece. As long as Greek thought was a living force the problem was discussed from the metaphysical or philosophical point of view. Later it passed into the realm of theology where it remained more than a thousand years. Spinoza again brought it into the domain of speculation, although he supposed his deductions drawn according to a strictly scientific method, where it remained until within a comparatively short time. It is well known that he was an out-and-out-determinist, maintaining that men's actions are guided entirely by conditions over which they have no control: men will what they will and do what they do because no other course is possible for them. That they imagine themselves free is wholly attributable to a misconception or to an underestimate of the forces by which they are swayed in every action of their lives. This doctrine received the support of a number of men eminent in the physical sciences who transferred the unvarying law they found operative in brute matter to the realm of mind. The distinguished French mathematician and astronomer, Laplace, who died in 1827, is said to have declared that every particle of dust blown about by the wind has its course exactly determined by conditions that existed from all eternity. I remember well that this theme was frequently discussed by my fellow-students and that all discussion never changed anybody's opinion; naturally enough, since students are not competent to take a profound view of a very profound subject. If envisaged from the traditional standpoint it is utterly useless to enter upon it again; and it seems at present to be attracting comparatively little attention. It has, however, been shifted to the realm of psychology where it assumes a new and practical importance, an importance that is equally great whether we accept the determinist or indeterminist horn of the dilemma.

Nobody denies that when we act consciously our action is the result of a weighing of motives, of a judgment, the decision being always in favor of the strongest. Although it is impossible to place two persons amid exactly the same external conditions they can be found so nearly alike that they may be regarded as identical for the purpose of argument. A boy is passing along the street on a cold day when few persons are out of doors. He observes in a sheltered nook two men engaged in conversation. Just then one of them takes from his pocket a purse and hands the other some money. But he does not notice, what has caught the boy's eye, that he inadvertently dropped a coin. A moment later the men are gone and the boy picks up what to his delight he finds to be a ten-dollar gold piece. He looks in every direction and is sure no one has seen him. He puts the coin in his pocket and decides to wait for developments. He knows the man who dropped the money and is sure the man does not know him. Meanwhile he deliberates upon what he will do with his treasure-trove. During the next few weeks he crosses the loser's path several times without attracting his notice, so that he is now sure that no suspicion rests upon him as the finder. So he decides to regard the money as his own and to spend it for himself in such a way as to attract as little attention as possible. Not long after another boy about the same age picks up a ten-dollar note from the pavement. He looks about but there is no one near who might have dropped the bill. His first feeling is one of joy when he thinks of the things he can buy with it. Then it occurs to him that he has no right to the money, at least until he has made an effort to find the owner. Somewhat sadly he takes it to a printing office, hands it to the editor, and tells him how he came by it. A notice in the next issue of the paper finds the loser, who, to his shame be it said, does not even reward the boy for his honesty. Although the boy feels that he has been unfairly treated and now especially is pricked with an occasional sting of regret that he did not keep the skinflint's money, yet a second thought always brings to his mind the conviction that he feels better for having done as he did. Those two boys who were tempted in exactly the same way were of the same age, had the same need of money, attended the same school and recited to the same teacher. While the temptations were

alike, one yielded, the other resisted. To what cause shall we attribute their diametrically opposite conduct? The motive was the same, the effect totally different. Evidently the decision was due to the difference in the psyche of the boys: one was honest by nature or from home-training, the other was not. Whether then we hold to the determinist theory or its converse, we can not escape the conviction that if we could change the environment of the two boys, the one might be made to take the place of the other. Substantially the same motive-cause produced diametrically opposite results or effects. If the honest boy could not help being honest any more than the dishonest boy could not help acting as he did, it follows as a matter of course that every community is vitally interested in so educating its youth that they will choose as a matter of course, automatically, if we choose to put it in this way, the right when they are compelled to decide between two equally possible courses of action. In every community there are persons who can not be reached or influenced by any moralizing agencies. It seems sometimes as if moral obliquity is the result of heredity traceable through three or four generations; far oftener it is the result of pernicious influences brought to bear on the particular individual. It does not follow that because the father is crooked the son will not be straight. If the proverb were true:

"Wie die Alten sungen
So zwitschern auch die Jungen,"

we might as well accept the inevitable and cease wasting our efforts on the rising generation. It by no means follows in a moral sense, as Milton says, that

"The childhood shows the man,
As morning shows the day."

We are wisely warned against praising the day before the evening, since many meteorological vicissitudes may take place between dawn and darkness. The writer has in mind at this moment a young man who is an honored minister of the gospel, whose father was a rogue and nobody. Nor is this an isolated,

although a somewhat conspicuous case. The young man attributes his view of life to the influence of a teacher for whom he cherishes the highest regard.

One need not be a profound student of sociology to become convinced that public opinion is a powerful force for good or evil; when it is otherwise it is usually the result of indifference rather than of positive wickedness. And public opinion can be greatly influenced by enlightenment. Every individual may contribute his mite to raise the general level. A German publisher in Leipzig once said to me that he did not hesitate to send books to the United States to persons who were unknown to him as he always felt sure of getting his pay; but experience had taught him to be careful to whom he sent a book in the Balkan States. Joseph Bertha, the leading character in the Erckmann-Chatrian novel entitled "Waterloo," is a striking example of the moral influence of environment. He was an exceptionally timid youth. When he found himself drafted into the army he was so frightened that he could scarcely walk or eat. When later he went into battle with a few companions braver than himself, he fought as valiantly as any of them.

Although in theology there have always been numerous and strong champions of predestination or determinism, there seems to have been no doubt among jurists that man is free and that the criminal is always responsible. It is only on such a supposition that we can account for the frightful atrocities of the criminal law. There is no more gruesome reading to be found in print than the history of jurisprudence on the continent of Europe. In some countries the torture was not abolished until the beginning of the nineteenth century. How a legal system could be built up on the assumption that a suspect could be made to confess if guilty, but not an innocent person, is a problem that is hard for us to understand. As lawyers were not more cruel than other members of the community their mental attitude is explicable only on the ground of an implicit belief in human responsibility; when a man became a law-breaker he acted with full knowledge of the consequences and could not be too severely dealt with. The belief that an accused person or an actual criminal should often be examined as to his responsibility is of recent origin. That our lawyers have gone too far

in the application of a principle now considered well established is evident to any one who reads the accounts of many of our trials. All laws are enacted and all pains and penalties prescribed for their infraction, proceed on the assumption that those who transgress them might have done otherwise. On the other hand, since psychology has been raised to the rank of a science the doctrine of individual responsibility has been greatly modified. Not only has the enlightened public come to realize that criminals are not always responsible as individuals but that the community is often to a greater or less extent *particeps criminis*. It is not merely that reformatories for minors and adults have been established in every civilized country at public expense, but the state is also striving to take away as far as possible incentives or allurements to crime. For this reason are not only public schools everywhere maintained by governments but the indigent are to a greater or less extent aided from public funds. In several countries of Europe the worthy aged poor are supported in whole or in part from the public treasury on the supposition that they are not responsible for their poverty. In other words, environment is frequently chargeable with indigence, and where the environment can not be materially changed the sufferers from adverse conditions should be supported to some extent at least by those who are in a greater or less measure responsible for it. When the environment is adverse the inefficient become indigent and the strong frequently become criminal, if their moral perceptions are obtuse or their wills weak. Desire is stronger than the subjective restraint imposed by the ethical motive, and the law is transgressed. But we are in danger of laying too much stress upon the word *community*. A number of rogues united into a community will not generate an honest public sentiment. St. Paul was aware of the importance of the individual when he wrote to the Romans: "Let every man be fully assured in his own mind." It should however be remembered, in this connection, that he was writing to a company of believers whom he assumes to have been willing and anxious to do what was right. It is true in practice, moreover, that a hundred men as we find them are more honest than any one or even than any ten taken at random, because there is a larger number interested in the honesty of all the rest. It will be

found that practically every iniquitous law, enacted by a legislature popularly elected, is due to an interested clique or to a misapprehension of its scope. All laws are ostensibly for the good of the larger number. It is the recognition of this fact that has given rise to the strong sentiment for publicity in all affairs in which the public is vitally concerned. The contention is, and it appears to be grounded on experience, that if the community knows what its servants are doing they can and will hold them to a strict accountability. The commandment which the rogue has the strongest faith in is: "Thou shalt not get found out." It is not true that what is everybody's business is nobody's business. It is demonstrably false in matters pertaining to civic righteousness. Ancient Athens furnished an instructive example. The popular assembly imposed the severest penalties on public officials who were found guilty of taking bribes and of embezzlement. In spite of the penalties men were constantly convicted of violating the express stipulations of the statutes, and many were punished. The mass was more upright than the man. Perhaps we may say that all men are honest when they are not themselves tempted. Let us, however, not be misled. Ethical growth is always due to individuals. People so enlightened as the Athenians could not fail to see that ethical principles can not be violated with impunity. Many of their speakers and writers kept persistently preaching this truth. But alas for the weakness of men! The majority lacked moral firmness to do what they clearly perceived to be their duty. Wherever there is progress somebody must be wiser and stronger and less narrowly selfish than the rest; otherwise stagnation will ensue. If the strong man is worse than the average represented by the group deterioration is inevitable. Assuming then that those who teach as well as those who preach are to a greater or less degree leaders, it is incumbent upon them to take high moral and religious grounds and endeavor to bring those under their influence up to their own level. "Teach" and "preach" are constantly employed as interchangeable terms in the New Testament. Christ is never spoken of as the Great Preacher but as the Great Teacher. There are men who are incorruptible under all circumstances and proof against all temptation. On the other hand it is well known that persons whose lives are regu-

lated at home by a strict ethical code sometimes become demoralized abroad and gradually sink to the average level of a foreign community whose moral code is lax. It has been frequently remarked by missionaries that herein lies a serious difficulty against which they have to contend. Missionaries are, however, responsible to the fostering agency at home while the man who migrates to a foreign country is usually responsible only to himself. Someone has said that we all live by admiration. This statement is perhaps too strong; it is true as a general proposition. The chief danger is that we may admire success rather than merit. It is undisputed that the low moral level of the politics of some of our states and cities is directly traceable to the unscrupulous methods of strong men who inoculated the electorate with a pernicious virus. On the other hand an opposite character has in numerous cases raised the electorate to high grounds in a few years. As a general proposition it is, however, always easier to regenerate an individual or a small group than larger aggregates. This was demonstrated by the success of the founders of Christianity; by Luther in the sixteenth century, and by the Wesleys and Whitefield in the eighteenth.

ARTICLE III.

THE OLD FAITH, BUT A MODERN THEOLOGY.

BY G. U. WENNER, D.D.

(Under the title: "*Moderne Theologie des alten Glaubens*," Dr. Theodore Kaftan, the General Superintendent of the Lutheran Church in Schleswig, has recently published a book which has attracted considerable attention. It is condemned by the conservatives as going too far, and by the liberals as not going far enough. The titles of the five chapters are: The Demand, What is Meant by the Old Faith, Christianity Stands and Falls with the Old Faith, What is Modern Theology, The Old Faith Demands a Modern Theology. In this paper I have attempted to give an abstract of the first two chapters. The remaining chapters I hope to present later.—G. U. W.)

I THE DEMAND.

The expression originated under the exigencies of the day. To many it may seem paradoxical. They say, if you adopt modern theology you must give up the old faith. Or, if you hold to the old faith, you must have nothing to do with modern theology. They attribute the effort to a cowardly disposition to mediate.

But it is a false presumption that the old faith and a modern theology are irreconcilable ideas. This comes from confusing faith and science.

For example, the fundamental controversy between the old school and the new in the question concerning Christ is whether the Gospel is a Gospel of Christ or Christ's Gospel, that is, whether Christ is the *object* or only the original *subject* of Christian faith. The old school holds to the former as its fundamental position. The latter is the fundamental position of the new school.

Now this question, whether Christ is the only begotten Son of God, is not a scientific question. No science can grasp it. And

yet the new school treats it as if it were a scientific question. In the field of science they inquire whether Christ is a specific Divine revelation or simply the product of religio-historic development.

Thus they affirm a knowledge-judgment where a faith-judgment alone is legitimate. For example, Jean Reville in his "Modern Christianity." He admits that we speak of science only where there is a methodical cognition of facts and events, phenomena. He that decides what God can do or can not do, acts as sensibly as if a child two years old were to decide what kind of problems a professor of mathematics might be able to solve.

And yet he holds that Christ belongs to a world which the human mind is able to regulate.

Science cannot solve the Christ question. Formerly it was tried on speculative grounds. Nowadays it is attempted in the field of history, especially in the field of religio-historic investigation. Here they show us that what we supposed was specifically Christian, comes from another source; or that analagous truths are found in other religions. So that what we thought was specifically and peculiarly Christian, vanishes.

With vast confidence this school proclaims that it has discovered the true course. The followers of Baur and Ritschl in their day bcasted the same. Their day has passed, and what is left of all their boasted discoveries? Not nothing. They reformed some of the earthen vessels in which the Divine treasure committed to us was contained, but nothing more. A new comprehension of Christianity this school will fail to inaugurate, just as all the other attempts in this direction failed. The Christ question is too large for historico-religious investigation. Indeed this is the rock on which it will split, in so far as it promises to disclose a new comprehension of Christianity. It will split on the idea which is their chief pride, the historical Christ, the untenableness of which cannot be permanently concealed.

The Christ question will again prove itself to be that which up to this hour it has always been, not a question of science but a question of faith. *The Christ question as well as the God question is a question of faith.*

But this confusion of faith judgments and knowledge judg-

ments exists also when the old school warns against modern theology.

Christian doctrines have been so intricately tied up in the formulas of the science of other days, that as a consequence, human inventions, which are fair objects of scientific investigation, have been deified and made objects of faith.

Many identify the truth of the Deity of Christ with a formulation of this truth which was constructed in a Greek workshop.

Others take the truth that in the Scriptures we have God's Word, and identify it with the dogma of inspiration. This is the mistake of the old school. They label a scientific question and call it a question of faith. For, the inspiration of which they speak is verbal inspiration. All attempts to maintain the dogma of inspiration without the verbal have failed. The usual formulation of these attempts is in the direction of Schleiermacher's inspiration not of the writings but of the writers. But this is not an affirmation but a repudiation of inspiration. Inspiration, that is, the inspiration of a book, is either verbal inspiration or it is not. Well, then, why not insist on verbal inspiration? Because anyone who reads the Bible for himself must see that it is not verbally inspired.

This indicates the mistake which the maker of the dogma committed. How did it happen?

They were experimentally certain that in the Scriptures they had God's Word, a certainty which they shared with the whole Christian Church of all ages, a certainty that is renewed to-day in every one who enters into a conscious Christian life. But how can these Scriptures, which certainly were written by men, be God's Word? That is the question which appealed to the Fathers and which appeals to every awakened person to-day.

It was Luther who pointed out the solution in his famous dictum: *Was Christum treibt, das ist Gottes Wort*. That which reveals Christ is God's Word."

The solution was found in the content and not in the origin. The Fathers took the opposite course and made a fatal mistake.

How the Scriptures originated is not a question of faith. The Bible is before us in its historical results, a literary product, an object in the world of phenomena, and hence a legitimate object

of scientific investigation. The Bible itself tells us how it originated, in history.

Hence to make this an object of faith which belongs to the realm of science, was a fatal mistake of the Fathers.

The old school therefore illustrates, as did the new school, that objects of faith and objects of science should not be confused.

Neither does this demand for a modern theology spring from an unhappy desire to mediate. This is the charge which the conservatives make against us.

Mediation has a bad reputation in the field of theology. This is as it should be. In practical life, where objects are brought into contact with each other in limited space, it is a good thing to mediate. But in the world of thought, where truth is the aim, all compromises are iniquitous, especially such as are the result of weakness. As such, every concession to modern thought is regarded by the adherents of the old faith.

We are not seeking for the approval of the liberal school. Ten times rather do we seek to be commended for being faithful to the Word of God. Besides, we should be fools if we imagined that we might gain the applause of the liberals by accepting this one or that one of their critical conclusions. The only way to gain a place among them is by sacrificing ourselves wholly upon the altar of their gods, the laws of nature. If we make concessions, or what seems to be concessions, they are such only as are necessary in the nature of things.

II. WHAT IS MEANT BY THE "OLD FAITH."

The term is frequently used, but not always in the same sense. Hence it is necessary to obtain a clear understanding of its meaning.

Its general characteristic is Christ faith. To the adherents of the old faith, Christ is the object; to the adherents of the new faith, Christ is the first subject of the Christian faith.

This is the line of cleavage, the characteristic difference. Whatever difference may separate the adherents of the old faith, the common ground on which they stand is Christ, the object of their faith. While this statement is correct, it is not adequate. Its fundamental features must be shown, of *faith*, and not of theology, and note particularly of the *old* faith.

In matters of faith the central conception is that of God. What is God?

New school writers discriminate learnedly between a psychic and a pneumatic God. But such ideas, whether developed in the heads of plain people or in the labyrinthine cerebrations of the philosophers, all belong to the sphere of natural cognition of God. But the God of the old faith is not a God of natural cognition. In the old faith we get to God not by way of the world but by way of the Word. The God of the old faith is the God of the Scriptures. And the God of the New Testament is a much greater God than the psychic and pneumatic Deity of the new school.

The God of the Scriptures is in the first place what is commonly understood by God, without whom nothing is that is; in short what the philosophers mean when they speak of the Absolute.

Likewise the God of the Scriptures is a Personality. Two ideas these, that will not fit into our thinking. Nor is it necessary. Comprehension of a conception of God is not a condition of its reality. We think and speak of God in human terms which do not grasp Him as He is. Our thought and word concerning Him is more or less in symbols. This does not disturb the old faith. We owe our knowledge of God, not to human speculation but to Divine revelation. Knowing Him as the Absolute and yet as a person, one to whom we stand in the relation of Thou and Thou, we know Him in reality. We but stammer when we speak of God, but nevertheless we know that He of whom we thus speak is an eternal reality.

But Absolute and Personality are not the expressions which the Old Faith uses when it speaks of God. Those terms have only been borrowed from another sphere. The Old Faith says: Almighty Father. In place of Absolute he says Almighty, that is, a living God, a God who doeth wonders. The student of nature doubts whether God doeth wonders, that is performs miracles. The greater the progress in the knowledge of nature, the more fixed becomes the conviction that its laws are inviolable. To the adherent of the Old Faith it is a matter of course that God performs miracles in accordance with His counsel and will. It is an integral factor of his conception of God.

We cannot explain God from the laws of nature. Our knowledge of nature is limited. It does not grasp all that is.

For Personality the Old Faith uses the term Father. The term, drawn from human relations, implies that He cares for us, trains us, and brings us to our destined end. It means that the Heavenly Father has all the details of our earthly life in mind, and yet is constantly guiding us to an eternal destiny. While no reason can grasp this thought, this Fatherly love embraces every individual. Nor can any other word, such as Final Cause, or the infinite of the mystics, take the place of this word Almighty Father.

For a complete understanding of what Almighty Father means to the Old Faith we must also consider what are human needs. It is an eternal destiny to which God is leading us to participate in the life which is in God, and this alone is life indeed, here and forever. God and the soul, the soul and God, in this religion consists. The Old Faith will say the same. Except that the Old Faith does not isolate itself. It is a fellowship, a kingdom of men lifted up to the eternal life in which the Old Faith beholds its final aim of God's dealing with men in this world. This is the gift of God, according to the Old Faith: Eternal life in God's eternal kingdom.

But the acceptance and experience of this gift is conditioned by another fact which is not less essential than the gift itself. Man as he is, is not fit for God. When the natural man finds God, he finds condemnation. If not, he has not really found God. In the presence of God, man is under the ban of guilt. If this ban is not removed, if the evil in him is not in the course of being overcome, a participation in the life of God, the everlasting life which is the gift of God, is impossible.

But this ban man himself cannot remove. The Old Faith knows to a certainty that God alone has done it and does it continually. This is its experience and assurance. The Old Faith has eternal life in God only on this basis, that God is gracious, who forgives sins and heals our diseases. The emphasis is on forgiveness. This is what we experience fully in this world. The healing, the sanctification, is a process. To sum up: the Old Faith is faith in the Father Almighty, who forgives us all

our sins, and in virtue of such forgiveness grants us everlasting life, here in time and there in eternity.

This is the first thing to be said in answer to the question what God means to the Old Faith. But there is a second, without which there is no first.

Christian Faith has always been conscious to itself of having been conditioned in history.

It is not the product of speculation, much as that has entered into it. Nor of inner experience, in spite of the significance of experience for the individual.

But it is the product of the history in which Christ is Alpha and Omega. So it was in the beginning of Christianity, so it has continued through the ages. Whatever fragments of theistic knowledge they may have had without Christ, in Him alone, have nations and individuals reached the true knowledge of God, forgiveness of sins, everlasting life. "*Through Jesus Christ*" is an indispensable element of the Old Faith. This means that Christ is the Mediator, the only Mediator, in whom we find God, and without whom the Divine life is impossible.

In this mediation three things are involved: Sonship, Mediatorial death, Resurrection.

Sonship. Jesus the Man of Nazareth occupies a unique relation to the living God, previously unattained, hereafter forever unattainable. It is that which constitutes Him what He is. This is learned not from Paul, nor from John, but from the Synoptics. E. g. Matt. 11:27: No one knoweth the Son save the Father, &c. The significance of this Sonship is that in Him we have a personal revelation of God. (1)

2. Mediatorial death. The Liberals also speak of a mediation, but it is the mediation of a prophet or teacher which they have in mind, such as have always existed, and not of a person who suffered and died for us, and one who gave a *λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν*

The Old Faith knows no mediation except that of which the cross is the center.

3. The Resurrection from the dead. How this took place, for this there is room for difference of opinion, but the fact is an essential position of the Old Faith.

(1) The author has no doubt on the subject of "conceived by the Holy Ghost," but he is not so certain of the Virgin Birth. He does not regard the two as necessarily correlative.

Finally the Old Faith insists upon a third truth without which these of the Father Almighty and "through Jesus Christ" would be incomplete. It says: "In the Holy Ghost," that is, in the strength of the Holy Ghost. This is an integral part of the Old Faith.

A believer knows that he is a believer, and as such a partaker of the fellowship with God in Christ, only through the power of the Holy Ghost. Just as Jesus Christ was the historical experience of the Church of the disciples, so the Holy Ghost is the experience of Christendom. So it was in the early Church, so it is to-day. It experiences Him as a power, enlightening, condemning the old nature, creating the new nature, glorifying Christ. But this does not complicate the God-faith. Just as it was God whom we experienced in Christ, so it is God by whom we are moved in the Holy Ghost. The Holy Ghost is God. The means through which the Holy Ghost works are word and sacrament. Reduced to its ultimate statement, the word, since the sacrament derives its efficacy from the word.

That upon which the emphasis is here placed is the presence of Christ in the word and sacrament.

Those who are opposed to the Old Faith frequently lay stress on this, that faith has to do not with the past but the present. Quite right. But that does not affect such things as the incarnation of Christ, His death and resurrection. So far as the Person of Christ is concerned, all this is present in the word and sacrament, and because He is present, that is what makes the word a word of God, and makes the sacrament really a sacrament.

The Liberals have no real word of God. For them the Bible is a constituent part of the literature of the world, with a certain religious quality. There are no real sacraments. They are simply venerable ceremonies, not ordinances of the Lord.

This cannot be otherwise. For word and sacrament are Christ-bearers, that is truly word of God and truly sacrament, if they are the products and representatives of a specific Divine revelation of God in Jesus Christ, and of this the new faith knows nothing.

God, the Holy Ghost, working effectively through the word and the sacraments, creates the Church. And the Church, the congregation, the *communio sanctorum*, is both the product and

the instrument of the Holy Ghost. To the Old Faith the Church is essentially that which is "in the Holy Ghost."

As a matter of course Church is here spoken of not in a hierarchical sense, or in the sense of a civil institution, or any kind of an external organization, but purely and simply in its essential characteristics as a communion of the word and sacrament.

It is the instrument of the Holy Ghost, because through the Church word and sacrament are made effective.

It is the product of the Holy Ghost, because in it are anticipated in the natural world that which is the supernatural purpose of God's plan, the kingdom of God.

In this double sense the doctrine of the Church is connected with the doctrine of the Holy Ghost and is a characteristic feature of the Old Faith in contradiction to the Liberal school, which knows nothing about Church because it has repudiated the word of God and knows nothing about the sacraments.

This Church, this communion of those who are being sanctified, which is making itself felt in all the world, both as the instrument of the Spirit, and the product of the Spirit, may be termed the realization, in which and through which faith, though essentially belonging to the unseen world, in innumerable channels enters into and controls the life of this present world with its visible forms and influences.

"In the Holy Ghost." This means in the power of the Holy Ghost, who through word and sacrament effects in us faith, which makes us members of the Church of Jesus Christ and thereby partakers of all the gifts of God in Christ Jesus.

To sum up and to express briefly but at the same time comprehensively: The Old Faith is faith in the Father Almighty, who forgives us all our sins, and by virtue of this forgiveness grants us everlasting life, here in this world and forever in the world to come. All this through Jesus Christ, His only begotten Son, who by His coming, His life and His death and His resurrection became the only Mediator between God and men. This He did in the Holy Ghost. that is in the power of the Holy Ghost who creates faith in us through the word and sacrament, and thus we become members of the Church of Jesus Christ and thereby partakers of all the gifts of God in Christ Jesus

This is what is meant by faith in the triune God.

In the faith which has here been described, the human soul comes into real touch with the everlasting and living God. Here there courses the Life which is the Light of men. Here there gushes forth from the depths of Divine grace that comfort which brings to the soul the peace of reconciliation. Here there manifests itself a strength which is from God and which creates a new life. And whatever blessings may have come to the world from the Christian Church in its work of brotherhood, or service, or of missionary labor, finds in the Old Faith as it has here been described its serene and ever-flowing fountain. And with this faith Christianity stands or falls.

ARTICLE IV.

MODERN ACQUISITIONS FOR THE INTERPRETATION OF THE BIBLE.

BY REV. J. F. SEEBACH, A.M.

No one questions the necessity of interpreting the Bible. It is the primary duty of all to whom are entrusted the "preaching" and "teaching" specified in the last commands of Christ. It is the instinctive request of those who are brought to face the momentous question, "What think ye of Christ? whose Son is He?" and it is the inevitable response of him whose help is sought. "Understandest thou what thou readest?" said Philip to the eunuch. "And he said, How can I except someone shall guide me?"

Christ himself has emphasized the importance of interpretation by the many examples enshrined in his teaching. The series of contrasts introduced by, "But I say unto you," are interpretations in which spiritual insight, historical sense, and grammatical accuracy are ideally combined. But nowhere are his powers more strikingly displayed than in His illuminating exposition of Malachi 4:5. The teachers of His day, misled by false principles of interpretation, debased by unworthy and material expectations, sought that in John Baptist which was impossible, and received his denial (John 1:21). The Master, searching the prophet for the words of His Father, saw clearly the truth declared, and proclaimed what seemed to contradict John, but really did not; for Malachi had not said, "I will send you Elijah, the prophet," but, "I will send you a prophet Elijah,"—"in the spirit and power of Elijah," the angel had said (Luke 1:17). If these passages still seem to carry a burden of contradiction for the present time, it is because the masters followed have come from the schools of the Rabbis, to the neglect of the spirit and method of Him who said, "One is your Master, even Christ."

Many methods of interpretation have contended with each other in the Church of Christ since men first felt the need of

bringing forth "treasures new and old" from the strong-room of God's Word. Naturally they made mistakes; unfortunately they persisted in them through centuries. Some of their conclusions remain to this day to obscure the clear light of truth. In many places the windows are closed, and we "see through a glass darkly;" and when the truth is sought, "the veil is" not "taken away."

But the promise of God is being steadily fulfilled. The Spirit who shall lead us into all truth is accomplishing his work, broadening and purifying knowledge, accelerating the process by the accumulation of many means and agents, that we may at length be free from the bondage of ignorance.

I. REVISIONS.

The most obvious of the modern acquisitions are, of course, the revisions of the Bible. I speak, naturally, of those in our own language, though there have been several others, of which the most notable, perhaps, is that of the German Bible. In spite of several well recognized deficiencies in the revisions, there can be no doubt of their incalculable value.

In the first place, they offer us a better and a truer text. Instead of a fourteenth century text,—a child of many erring ancestors,—we have one taken by the most exact and competent scholarship from manuscripts that were certainly written early in the fourth century, and probably reach back into the second century, of our era,—venerable parchments, patriarchs of the day when men knew men who had spoken with the apostles of Christ. The value of this cannot be overestimated.

Besides this, they provide a vocabulary suited to modern needs. Who of us has not felt the burden of obsolete words when standing in the pulpit, or meeting the hesitant questioning of an inquirer? But now the mysterious "leasing" (Psalm 4:2) is readily known as plain *lying*, and the dangerous attempt to "prevent" God (Psalm 88:13) is appreciated as the gracious privilege of *coming before* Him by the pathway of prayer.

In this connection, we should not lose sight of the many modifications of words not obsolete, but inaccurately chosen. The example in Matthew 26:28 may stand for many others. In the

Authorized Version Christ is made to say, "For this is my blood of the new testament;" while in the American Revision the wording is, "for this is my blood of the covenant." It needs little thought to see the superiority of the latter. It is truer, for the institution was not a legal document; it is clearer, for the ordinary reader will confound that "New Testament" with the latter part of the Bible. It will be seen, too, in this and other cases, that the change is more than verbal.

And then they give us innumerable examples of more judicious phrasing whereby the light penetrates into many dusky corners of Holy Writ. Two examples must suffice. (a) First, there is that noble chapter of Isaiah—the ninth. The obscurities and mistakes of the old reading were not wholly able to conceal the lofty dignity of its thought; but now, clothed aright, it reveals the infinite tenderness of Israel's God in the declaration that confronted the faithful of Isaiah's day, and may now console those who come with like perplexities and sorrows. (b) Then there is that place of mysteries and linguistic marvels, Job 28:1-11. Who has ever understood the Authorized Version rendering? Who would care to catalogue the varying comments on the English text? Yet the transformation that has been wrought in the Revised Version is largely by means of language suited to the activity described; for the description is that of mining, and the operations are those that every miner knows,—but who would have recognized it without the new phrasing?

To all these let us add the removal of the impossible interpretative headings attached to so many books and chapters of the Bible. It is a relief and an education to have the purified Word speak for itself; for this, though a negative acquisition in one aspect, is positive in its benefit for everyone.

There is one acquisition that has for the present a more limited acceptance. I refer to the many unofficial revisions, paraphrases, and independent translations of larger or smaller portions of Scripture. The *Modern Reader's Bible* and the *Twentieth Century Bible* are representatives of the first; the *Messages of the Bible* and paraphrases like those of Lightfoot show forth the purpose and method of the second; the work of every commentator, and the interpretation of every isolated portion

of Scripture, give us myriad examples of the last. Each offers its contribution with varying success. The time has gone by for large changes to be effected by these methods; but an important work remains for the last-named, the results of which will gradually, but more rapidly than heretofore, find their way into future revisions.

The results of such interpretation are various. Sometimes they are indirect, as in a recent examination of Paul's phrase, "as a man." There has always been uncertainty about these words, because they seem to deny inspiration to certain portions of the apostle's writing. But now it seems clear that Paul means to say that he will use an illustration from human life as over against one taken from Scripture. Here the interpretation carries with it a change of word in Galatians 3:15, for with this conclusion the legal word "testament" would be more accurate than the religious word "covenant."

Sometimes the result is negative, offering no substitute for the reading criticised. For instance, in Ephesians 3:15 the assonance in the original, (*patera--patria*), indicates the very closest relation between the two words, "Father" and "family." But the word "family" is in several respects unfortunate. Originally the "familia" did not mean the children, but the servants, of a household. So Defoe could say, "I was a single man, but I had a family of servants." As a term, therefore, it takes its origin not from the highest but from the lowest in the household. If we had a personal term equivalent to the territorial appellation "fatherland," the difficulty would be removed; but as it is we can go no further at present than to notice the limitations of the term now used.

Sometimes the improvement is already partly recognized. There is such an instance in Luke 9:30, 31 with respect to the word "decease." Luke's word is "exodus," and it is a pity that the word was not transliterated instead of being so inadequately translated by "decease." The word in the margin, "departure," would be preferable, and sometime it will come to its own. For the Master's "exodus" comprehended more than his death; it involved also his passion, cross, resurrection and ascension,—and these are by no means subordinate to his death. Moreover, it may be questioned whether the Transfiguration was essentially

a preparation for death. It is suggestive to consider the messengers from the Father. "Moses was without a sepulchre; Elijah was without a shroud." From this we may gather more than the mere announcement of death; there would be nothing transfiguring in death alone. And so, Luke speaks of that which is fulfilled as a "departure," not a "decease."

Sometimes the result is a proposed change of such varied relations that many will hesitate to apply what is accepted. Take the etymology of "alaf." It has two meanings—"thousand" and "tent" or "family." No student of Hebrew will doubt the double meaning of the word. Yet, when it is applied to the numbering of the tribes of Israel, we have a surprising difference. Instead of 600,000 people we have 598 tents or families, with a total of about 5500 people. Professor Petrie urges this interpretation for two reasons. First, because the common method of computation is by families and not by numbers. Secondly, because this enumeration would reduce the Hebrews to numbers more nearly equal to the Amalekite inhabitants of the Sinaitic Peninsula, with whom they contended.

II. ARCHAEOLOGY.

No class of Biblical students can remain indifferent to the contributions of archaeology. Each school looks eagerly to it for the proof of its own position. Consequently no apologetic is called for.

And what a work it has accomplished! Bit by bit it uncovers the cities and roads that swarmed with life in the morning of the world. The so-called legendary portions of Genesis become fragmentary transcripts of history. The enemies of Abraham receive a "habitation and a name." The puzzling movements of the patriarchs are explained. The mysterious Hittites take their place among the nations of the world. The obscure Horites have their cavernous homes and altars uncovered. We can look upon the "bricks without straw," and walk upon Jeremiah's pavement in Egypt, from which he prophesied.

This science, too, has lent its powerful aid to the New Testament. The masterly work of Ramsey throughout Asia Minor; the excavations in Egypt, Greece and Italy, have all made

the time and surroundings of the apostolic labors more real and vivid. And there will be more, much more; for this is but the beginning, and who can tell the end!

But there is one development of archaeology, of late origin and unusual purpose, that may arrest our attention for more than a passing moment. In some respects it is the most important development that has yet been presented, and it is hard to conceive that one can come that shall surpass it. It is the discovery of the basis of New Testament Greek. I call it a discovery, for it is nothing less,—a theory it really never was.

We are all acquainted with the theory that the language and grammar of the New Testament stand alone in the realm of literature. As late as 1894 Professor Blass of Halle declared that New Testament Greek was "to be recognized as something peculiar, obeying its own laws." This modern view is merely a modification of the claim first advanced in the Purist controversy of the 17th century, that the Holy Spirit had framed a new language for the purposes of revelation.

This theory seems strange now, and can be explained only on the ground of fixed, preconceived ideas. It seems strange, because various human influences were freely recognized. There were the words that were known to be, some of earlier, some of later, idiomatic Greek. There were the many marks of popular speech,—the use of compounded and sesquipedalian words, the frequent use of the diminutives, the changed forms of verbs and the modified sense of nouns. There were also the influences of Roman judicial and military terms, of Greek life and concepts, of Egyptian commerce, Oriental mysticism and, most significant of all, Hebrew and Aramaic words and constructions.

All these found mingled in the then universal speech ought naturally to have suggested the striving after a medium of expression that should be intelligible to the composite population of the Roman Empire; or, what is even more likely, that the language they used was the common speech resultant upon their mingling. The Reformers on this, as on many another question, took an advanced position, one that was sadly obscured in the century immediately following. They readily acknowledged the literary inferiority of New Testament Greek, but saw in it only a mark of great divine condescension to the humblest of men

that their common speech should be made the medium of God's blessed truth. In this they were at one with the early Christian apologists who, when their assailants pointed sarcastically at the "boatman's idiom" of the New Testament, gloried in the taunt, and made this very homeliness their boast.

The chief stone of stumbling until lately, however, was that only one standard of comparison was available—the Greek of the classics. Between this and the Greek of the Testaments there were differences that seemed unaccountable by natural laws. There were changes and peculiarities of form for which no lexical or syntactical reason could be offered. And when these were considered in connection with the change in content of words due to the exigencies of use for religious purposes, the divine fiat theory seemed to be the best-working hypothesis.

But the last ten years have changed all that, for in that time the work of Professor Deissmann and a few others has been recognized, and a new standard of comparison established—that of the common Greek speech of the apostolic times.

We are all acquainted with the marvelous discoveries of papyri made during the last century, especially those from Fayum, Oxyrynchus-Behnesa and other portions of Upper and Middle Egypt. For a long time they were neglected, or made use of by very few scholars. Interest in them was gradually heightened by the discovery of fragments of Scripture; but when the now famous Logia were found, a great change came over the attitude of the scholarly world toward these memorials of by-gone days. Then it was discovered what a treasure lay hidden in the products of the rubbish heaps of these ancient cities.

Here were found "discarded files of documents from public and private offices, worn-out books and fragments of books, legal documents of the most various kinds, e. g., leases, accounts and receipts, marriage contracts and wills, attestations, official edicts, petitions for justice, records of judicial proceedings, and a large number of documents relating to taxes; then letters and notes, exercise books, charms, horoscopes, diaries," and all forms of the script incident to the expression of the common activities of life.

When these were considered and studied in connection with other results of excavation in various parts of the world, e. g.,

inscriptions cut on stone, cast in bronze, scratched on lead or gold plates, wax tablets, wall scribblings, coins and medals, and, last but not least, the inscribed ostraca or potsherds—the common stationery of the poorer classes of that day—a surprising and revolutionary discovery was made.

Here in common use by non-Christians of widely separated portions of the then known world were many of the linguistic peculiarities of the New Testament Greek. The similarities were unmistakable, as were the departures from the style of classic Greek. The conclusion was inevitable; these forms were the forms of non-literary prose,—the common speech of the people. Therefore, the sacred scribes of the New Testament had used the language of common life, the speech of the people they approached with the message of salvation.

It is yet too early to indicate the specific influences of this development upon the interpretation of Scripture. The most important and wide-reaching change must be the different attitude toward the vehicle of revelation. The result of this cannot be easily or quickly estimated. Time is needed to declare the full value of this new contribution to the science of interpretation.

One concrete example I cannot refrain from citing, partly because of its practical bearing upon a problem often presented to us. It is the light thrown on the words of Christ, (Matthew 10:8 ff.; Mark 6:8; Luke 9:3; 10:4; 22:55 ff.) "Freely ye have received, freely give. Get you no gold, nor silver, nor brass in your purses; no wallet for your journey." What is the meaning of "wallet?" The Greek word "*pera*" is generally taken to mean a travelling-bag, a term that is general and somewhat vague in its meaning. Professor Deissmann has recently made a stimulating comment on this passage (*Expository Times*, November 1906) from which I shall here quote at length.

"A special meaning made known to us by an ancient stone monument suits the passage at least as well as the general meaning of 'travelling-bag.' A Greek inscription of the Roman period has been discovered at Kefr Hauar in Syria, in which a 'slave' of the 'Syrian goddess' speaks of the begging expeditions he has undertaken for the 'Lady.' This heathen apostle—who speaks of himself as 'sent by the Lady'—tells with triumph how each of his journeys brought in seventy bags. Here he uses our

word 'pera.' It means, of course, not bags filled with provisions and taken on the journey, but a beggar's collecting-bag. This special meaning would suit the New Testament passages admirably, especially the context in St. Matthew:; You are not to earn money, and you are also not to beg. The divine humility of Jesus would stand out anew with this inscription as back-ground were we to adopt this possible interpretation of the word 'pera.' In the days of early Christianity the mendicant priest of the ancestral goddess wanders through the Syrian land; from village to village the string of sumpter animals lengthens, bearing his pious booty to the shrine; and the Lady will not be unmindful of her slave. In the same land, and in the same age, was One who had not where to lay His head, and He sent out His apostles with the words: 'Freely ye received, freely give. Get you no gold, nor silver, nor brass in your purses; no wallet for your journey.'

III. ANCIENT MANUSCRIPTS.

There can be no doubt of the importance and value of these for the interpretation of the Bible. The contentions of Dean Burgon long ago ceased to arrest attention. The intelligence of the world is at one in appreciating the contributions of the ancient codices towards the restoration of the original text of the New Testament. That is an old story, but one that will never lose its interest, I imagine; for where the various revisions reach with their stimulating and educative effect, there will the story be retold as a memorial of them.

From the very nature of the case, however, their influences will always seem somewhat obscure and uncertain, because of the indirectness of the results, and the comparative smallness of the changes they may effect. There is no doubt that we have in general the true text of the New Testament. The reverence of the transcribers would assure that. Even the manuscripts on which the revisions are based have occasioned no revolution, but only a reform, in the subject-matter of the text. The dust of ages has been blown away; accretions have been removed; elisions have been replaced; phrases have been adjusted. But we have no new Bible, only a clarified one.

It is not possible that even so great a change as this can be again effected by the further discovery of ancient rolls or codices, parchments or papyri. Those we have are too ancient to allow space or time for considerable differences of any kind. Further documents may be found corroborating the Logia as veritable reminiscences of the saying of Jesus. Some of the lost letters of Paul, and other apostolic writings, may possibly see the light. But these are at most only possibilities, not acquisitions, and would make no change in the Bible. The reverence of men for the forms of sanctity and an invincible hesitation, would advance them no further than an appendix to the Sacred Tome.

But the contributions of the manuscripts are not ended. The late and increasing treasures of the Sinaitic monasteries are prophetic of that. Ancient copies of ancient versions—Syriac, Coptic, Armenian, etc.—furnish testimony of still more ancient originals, and suggest emendations, original words and phrases, that cannot be ignored. Often not a word is changed, but the sense of a passage is effectually modified. Sometimes a new word is introduced which at once approves itself by its very presence. It may never be incorporated in the standard text, but its power will be felt.

There is a partial illustration of this in a new reading of Luke 23:39 that has recently been deciphered in an ancient Syriac palimpsest. It runs as follows: "Art thou not the Saviour? Save thyself alive to-day, and also us." They are the words of the impenitent thief. The assonance of "Saviour" and "save" in the English reproduce very well the same effect in the Syriac—to which the Semitic taste was very partial. But there is also a further significance when beside this sentence we place Christ's words to the other thief, "*To-day* thou shalt be with me in Paradise." "*To-day*," viewed as a word repeated by Christ, receives additional emphasis. Those familiar with Semitic idiom see some value in this variant "still enshrined in what was once the Bible of the Syriac-speaking Church." No variant may be neglected, for it may possibly represent the recollection of some early disciple.

And here is another. This same palimpsest introduces the word "standing" into John 4:27, so that it reads somewhat as follows: "And upon this came his disciples; and they marveled

that he was standing speaking with a woman." Can one fail to see the suggestiveness here? We must, of course, guard ourselves against the Occidental tendency to see in this attitude a manly deference and courtesy toward woman, for its import is really a more religious one

Let us recall the circumstances. The disciples had left Him by the well-side utterly weary—"as he was" is very expressive of complete fatigue—and hungry, for they had gone to buy food. But when they return, the fatigue is gone, for he is standing; and when they proffer the food they went to obtain, He says: "I have meat to eat that ye know not." What has caused the change?

There is no new thought added to the passage, for the change in the Master's condition is most naturally attributable to the spiritual uplift of the incident. His eagerness for humanity's welfare and this unexpected susceptibility of the woman after the depressing experiences in Jerusalem are the simplest explanations of the transformation in Him. But while the attitude does not change the teaching of the incident, it emphasizes it. The posture is suggestive, the more so because it is so natural. It is the inevitable gesture of earnestness, and so lights up the story with a vividness that makes it more humanly real, more divinely touching.

Take with this one other use of the word "standing" in connection with Christ. This is already in our text. It is when Stephen stands looking steadfastly into heaven, and sees "the Son of Man *standing* on the right hand of God." In every other instance recorded the Son of Man is described as sitting, but this first martyr is about to come, and He stands to receive him. There is the same eagerness, the same mindfulness, the same advance.

Put these two side by side and, while you may not put the word into the text of John's gospel, you will always see the Son of Man *standing* speaking with the woman of Samaria.

IV. RESULTANT ADVANTAGES.

Here I shall stop, though I should like to show at some length the advantages these acquisitions afford us. Let me but indicate

them. We are made increasingly sure of the Bible's meaning. We are made more familiar with the conditions of thought and living in the times concerned. There is produced a realization of the eternal oneness of mankind. There naturally follows a greater facility of applying the Biblical facts and teachings to the needs of the present day. The word of God is humanized, so that none can say hereafter: "These people were different from myself, living under different conditions." Its precepts are made more reasonable—divinely, sweetly reasonable. And—we are nearer the truth!

ARTICLE V.

THE BIBLICAL DOCTRINE OF THE HEART.

BY NORMAN S. WOLF, B.D.

The importance of the heart with respect to its inward and outward relations to life and the activities of the animate creation, finds its expression not alone in the Bible. Parallel with the teachings of the Bible are the firmly grounded teachings of the ancient peoples who inculcated a sacred regard for the heart. The earliest Egyptian records, found in *The Book of the Dead*, reveal the fact that the blood was considered the life of man, in the heart existed the source of the life of man, that is, the heart was the sustaining center of life after birth. The heart, as the embodiment of life, was the gate-way to the presence of the gods, and there, after death, it was returned with all self-conscious powers, by the chief of the gods.

Abundant evidence has been discovered, not only in Egyptian records, but also in the records of other primitive peoples, to confirm the fact that the heart was everywhere held in highest veneration. It was considered as the vital center for all the activities of the soul. Even to-day in heathen countries it receives this primitive veneration.

It is thus seen that the doctrine of the heart, not only as the center of physical life, but also as the center of the pneumatico-physical realm of man, antedates the distinct promise of God, given through Moses to the Children of Israel, saying: "And Jehovah, thy God, will circumcise thy heart and the heart of thy seed, to love Jehovah, thy God, with all thy heart and with all thy soul, that thou mayest live." Deut. 30:6.

Though no one can with certainty declare the historical beginning of the human race, nor even its primal separation and segregation into families, clans, and tribes which formed the head waters of the profane nations that were a perpetual worry to the Children of Israel, yet we may confidently infer, that, back in the obscure morning of history, before God called Abraham from out of the Chaldee, or before He saved the eight souls

by water, the heart, according to their way of thinking, was the part of man by which he reached out towards his God or gods. On the other hand it was also the medium by which divinity disposed man for definite ends. The heart was the home of divinity and of the self-conscious *ego* that stirred in it. It was the common meeting place of God and man.

I. AN ATTEMPTED EXPLANATION.

One thing is sure, before physiological and psychological investigations were instituted, people gave to the heart all the powers exercised by the soul and the body. No particular reason is given for regarding it thus. The acceptance of this fact was quite natural, for, with but a few exceptions, and those chiefly among heathen philosophers, and in Dan. 2:28; 4:2, 7, 10; 7:1,5; the *nous*, which is the Septuagint translation for *lebh*, had not been assigned to the brain as the sphere of its activity. Pythagoras, 580-500 B. C. (?) was the first philosopher to ascribe the activity of the *nous* to the brain. This belief was not generally accepted until later investigation of philosophy and physiology demonstrated beyond doubt the truth of his belief.

The head is recognized in Scripture, but only for the external appearance which it presents of the internal state and agency of the soul. It is the part on which the hand is laid in blessing, in consecration, in healing, and over which the anointing oil is poured, in order that these may prevade the whole natural state of the man.

The countenance is regarded as the mirror of divine influences and emotional states and transports which light up the external appearance from an inner glow. Thus we see the Biblical distinction of an outer nature, *prosopon*, *rosh*, Is. 13:8; the visible, personal appearance of man; and of an internal nature, *psuche*, *nephesh*. But nowhere is there ascribed to the head psychical functions. Seeing and hearing though located functionally in the eye and ear, are nowhere referred to by Scripture as activities of the soul, located in the head. The soul is the back-ground of every sense-perception, and its home is in the heart.

Is there any plausible explanation to be found to justify the Biblical usage of "heart?" Were we speaking of present-day

ideas, we would smile at this puerile idea of conferring psychical functions upon a muscular organ, by whose contraction and expansion the circulation of the blood is effected, and by circulation, both assimilation and invigoration. But in the Biblical use of "heart" we find such a close relation existing between it and blood, and sacrifice, and atonement, that here there seems to be found an explanation. This relation is shown to have existed also in legendary and ancient history. (7)

In the days of early Bible history, though men had not the faintest idea of the circulatory system of the blood, and of the heart's relation to such a system, we may reasonably infer that they had more than an intimation of the close relation between heart and blood. But this cannot answer for the prominence given to the heart in the Bible, except as it may answer to a generic conception of man. Even if the heart was thought to sustain a mysterious relation to the blood, so far as its origin was concerned, this fact does not explain why it should have been made the repository for all the higher activities of the soul. That such is the case a most casual reading of the Bible establishes beyond doubt.

The doctrine of *the heart*, as the Bible teaches it, starts with ideas of life and of blood. These ideas are divinely attested to, which at once separates the Bible teachings from the superstitions and fancies of heathen and legendary doctrines, though underneath these may be a substratum of divine enlightenment conferred by means of the intuitional faculty, generic to man, to which we were not wont to give due amount of credence.

In Gen. 9:4, we find this statement made: "But flesh with the life therefore, which is the blood thereof, shall ye not eat." Here "life" and "blood" are in apposition. The flesh of every "living thing" was to be used for food, on condition that the blood be shed before using. Often in Scripture do we find reference to this prohibition, for the blood is the soul of the flesh. Another reason for prohibiting the eating of blood is found in Lev. 17:11: "For the soul of the flesh is in the blood, and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls." The

(7) *The Blood Covenant*; pp. 99-110

word used for soul in these references and elsewhere is *nephesh*, which constitutes the vital principle in man and beast.

But Gen. 9:5 places a further restriction on man's blood. The blood of beasts is not to be eaten; it must be "poured out;" but here we find the positive command that man's blood is not to be shed. A penalty is added to the shedding of man's blood: "Surely your blood, the blood of your lives will I require at the hand of every beast, and at the hand of man, even at the hand of every man's brother, will I require the life of man," for this reason added in verse 7—"for in the image of God made he man." Here we find the same dependence of life upon the blood, but it is of a higher nature and of greater value than animal life. Here is included the individualizing principle which is the characteristic gift to man from the breath of God.

Since the *life of the body*, which is the *soul*, is in the *blood*, and it, i. e., the life, employs the blood as its agent for all activities of the body and soul, and since the heart is everywhere spoken of as the home of the soul for man and beast, though the soul, *nephesh*, of man differs in its origin from that of the beast, it naturally follows that the heart, in which all life finds its full expression, is the point of union between the blood and the activities of the soul. The life which is in the blood finds its support, its direction and its final disposition in the heart.

Moreover, let it be remembered also, that the blood is not the only agency through which the soul acts. Primarily *nephesh* means "that which breathes"—as in the acts of respiration; hence Jer. 15:9, Job 31:39 speak of "breathing out of the soul." The soul also acts in taking and depends on nourishment as is shown in various statements which indicate kinds of foods and drinks to be eaten and the benefits derived therefrom. Whence comes the energy for these activities? A common, central, energizing point between the activities and the life which supports them must be recognized. We may rightly confer this energizing power upon the heart.

Though the life of man, the soul, is in the blood, yet it is clearly shown that this life centers in the heart. For instance, when instantaneous death was desired, Abner smote Ashael "under the fifth rib." Likewise Joab administered death to Ab-

salom by thrusting his darts through the heart. Transfixing the heart was known to bring sure and immediate death.

II. THE HEART AS THE CENTER FOR 1. "ANIMA." 2. "ANIMUS."

The heart lies therefore at the very center of the life which is *in the blood*, and this life includes not only the vital principle as it is found in man and beast, but the personal principle of man also which is the spiritual principle. This personal spirit is inseparably connected with the body and uses it as an instrument. By it all the phenomena of the senses are received and interpreted and built into physical, moral and religious strength. Not that the sentiency lies in the heart are we to understand this relation of heart and personal life, but by means of the heart's activity, as the central organ for circulation, this relation is established and maintained.

The heart, as the home of the soul, sustains to it a double relation, for the soul has a double sphere of activity. On the one hand it is kept from stagnation and death by this throbbing organ in our breasts. Even it itself is kept pulsating by the very same life which it distributes throughout the body. On this distribution rests the life of the senses as well as the activities of the body. In this aspect of life, that is, the principle of life, we call the soul "*anima*."

On the other hand it is evident also that the soul is dependent on this river, charged with the elements of life for its *spiritual* activities, using *spiritual* dichotomously, and attributing to it all the states of the soul and those acts which speak of spiritual discernment and communion with God. Here the soul is termed "*animus*." How the transition of energy is effected, that of the spiritual into the realm of flesh and sense and *vice versa*, who can tell? But that it occurs, who will doubt? Is it not certain that in the ceaseless ebb and flow which arises out of the pulsations of the heart, there is present that mysterious union of the spirit of life which keeps soul and body in a unified, mutually dependent being, that being which in "the beginning" God was pleased to call man?

It is not a forced inference, therefore, to attribute to the heart all the activities in which man can engage. We now regard it

merely as a muscular propelling center for the circulation, lifeless in itself, except as it is animated by the soul which is the medium of life, yet it is quite natural and reasonable to attach to it such a dependence of life, that while it continues to throb, some strands of hope remain unsevered. It is the central organ of the unity of man's existence. Thought may cease, consciousness may even depart for a season, the functions of the other organs may be suspended indefinitely, even the heaving of the breast as in asphyxiation, and yet within a reasonable limit of time this life-dispensing again will maintain the spark needful for resuscitation. To quote Beck—"The heart is the first thing to live. It existed before the organism, and even furnishes materials for the formation of it. So too, it survives the organism, being the last organ that fulfils its office." This points to the meaning which the Scriptures give to the heart, namely, center of life. Its first motion is the sure sign of life, its stillness the sure sign of death.

III. THE HEART AS THE CENTER FOR PHYSICAL LIFE.

We have sufficiently shown above that the heart is the center for the whole life of man. Before we proceed to a consideration of specific psychical functions attributed to it, let us note that the Bible recognizes it as the center for physical strength. When the three men appeared to Abraham on the plains of Mamre, he hastened to set before them a morsel of bread and butter, (curds of milk) and flesh, that their hearts might be strengthened, meaning thereby, the alleviation of their fatigue, a restoration to comfort and strength. The same significance is found in Acts 14:17, where Paul affirms that "God gave rain from Heaven and fruitful seasons, filling our hearts with food and gladness."

Thus the partaking of food and drink becomes the strengthening of the whole man. It is not to be understood that the heart is the receptacle for food and drink, but rather, by the partaking thereof, life is quickened, whereupon the heart, the center of life, becomes the recipient of this added strength, thus becoming the restorer of strength to the whole body.

IV. THE HEART AS "NOUS."

The Bible, in its reference to the heart, as the center of man's psychological functions, aims at no scientific statement of psychological laws. It deals with the content of revelation, which has been the same qualitatively, and at the same time continuous and progressive through the ages. Man, because of his self-conscious constitution, is the recipient of this revelation. To him it is addressed, in harmony with the psychological conceptions of the various eras of development.

In an endeavor to systematize the Bible references to the heart, we shall do so in accordance with the laws of psychology, remembering that the mind whose realm of activity is the soul, acts in each act of consciousness as a unit, and thus may be referred aptly to the common center, the heart. Also for the Old Testament and New Testament, we shall endeavor to show similarity of ascriptions to the heart and note differences where such may be found.

The Bible knows nothing of the sensorium, the back-ground, or rather the foundation of the psychical realm, as it has been set forth in modern times. It starts with the assumed fact that man has certain powers in his soul which distinguish him from the rest of creation. By these powers he is enabled to regulate and adapt himself, as well as to be the recipient of divine favor and retribution.

Taking these powers in an orderly sequence, let us first look at the heart as the center of the *nous*. Here it becomes the source of thought-conceptions, including the imagination, the memory and the understanding.

That the heart perceives and understands is shown in Deut. 29:4: "But Jehovah has not given you a heart to know." Acts 16:14: "Whose heart the Lord opened to give heed." That upon which one relies and in which he finds direction is bound or written in the heart; Deut. 10:16: "Therefore shall ye lay up these my words in your hearts;" while everything kept for memory's use is stored in the heart; Luke 2:51: "His mother kept all these saying in her heart;" and Isa. 65:17: "And the former shall not be remembered nor come unto the mind," i. e., *lebh*.

Thinking in Gen. 17:17 is called "speaking in his heart," and because thinking is centered in the heart, it becomes the birth-place of words, Matt. 24:48: "Shall say in his heart, my Lord tarrieth," also Job 8:10 utters words out of their hearts, so also in Matt. 12:34: "Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh." The heart is the seat of wise thoughts and deceits and inventions, therefore the wise man is the man with a heart. Ex. 28:3—"And the man who is void of understanding, to him there is no heart." Jer. 5:21: "Hear now this, O foolish people and without understanding," *lebh*.

V. THE HEART AS THE CENTER OF FEELING.

The heart is also the center for the soul's emotions. In it originate the feelings and affections. The *splangchna* are the seat of compassion and pity. The heart being a part of the *splangchna* has a share in the emotional states of the soul, but never is it the seat of compassion. From it spring the other emotions, affections, desires, appetites, passions, etc.

The heart knows various degrees of joy, ranging from pleasures to that of transport; Job 29:13: "I caused the widow's heart to sing for joy." Isa. 65:14: "Behold my servant shall sing for joy of heart." Acts 2:46: "They did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart." It also feels sorrow and pain, and crushing trouble. Isa. 65:14: "But ye shall cry for sorrow of heart" Jno. 16:6: "Sorrow hath filled your heart." Acts 21:13: "What mean ye to weep and break mine heart." It is the seat of anger and raging madness, and from it springs the desire for vengeance Jas. 3:14: "If ye have bitter envying and strife in your hearts, glory not." Deut. 19:16: "Lest the avenger of blood pursue the slayer while his heart is hot." Acts 7:54: "When they heard these things they were cut to the heart."

A peculiar emotion, a burning of the heart, is expressed in Luke 24:32, when Jesus, in a surprising way, reveals to the two disciples on their way to Emmaus, the secret, inner meaning of the Scriptures which caused them to say later: "Did not our hearts burn within us, while He talked to us by the way, and while He opened to us the Scripture?" The heart is the place where a loved one is cherished, and it is also the center

of goodwill. 2 Cor. 7:3: "Ye are in our hearts to die and to live with you." The heart is crushed and withered by sorrow and fear. "Ps. 102:4: "My heart is smitten and withered like grass." Jer. 23:9: "My heart within me is broken because of the prophets." It is touched by sympathy. Hos. 11:8: "My heart is turned within me and my repentings are kindled together;" it is weakened by fear. Deut. 20:8: "What man is there who is fearful and faint-hearted, let him go and return unto his house, lest his brethren's heart faint as well as his heart."

VI. THE HEART AS WILL.

Yet one aspect of the psychical realm needs to be investigated, that of the will. That the heart was considered the center of this self-regulative power is plainly shown in both the Old and New Testaments. It is in the heart as a formative faculty that the accumulated ideas and conceptions are raised to the service of the will in its decisions. Here they are unified and arranged into judgments and resolutions. Thus man is given the power to choose, reject or desire and arrange the phenomena, that are constantly rushing from-without, inward, as well as his own subjective states. Isa. 10:7: "Howbeit he meaneth not so, neither doth his heart think so, but it is in his heart to destroy and cut off nations not a few." Esther 7:5: "Who is he, and where is he who durst presume in his heart to do so?" Ex. 35:21: "And they brought a free-will offering unto Jehovah; every man and woman whose heart made them willing to bring it." 2 Cor. 9:7: "Let every man do according as he hath purposed in his heart." 1 Sam. 14:7 "Do all that is in thy heart." Thus, the heart is the center for choice, for strong determination. It acts consciously with reference to the motive or object in view. Acts 11:23: "He exhorted them all, with purpose of heart that they would cleave unto the Lord."

VII. THE HEART, THE CENTER OF THE MORAL LIFE.

With these brief allusions to the various spheres of psychical activity, we shall now turn to the most important aspect of the

Biblical doctrine of the heart, it is the ethical aspect, the final disposition of all we have thus far considered. Thought, feeling and will, *per se*, would be of little value if there were not an ideal toward which to rise. It is that harmonizing of all our conscious experiences to the norm of right as established by Absolute Righteousness which forms the fullest expression of the heart-life. All the acts of thought, feeling and will, when viewed in the light of Scripture are always conceived of from a moral stand-point. At once this conception lifts the heart into an invaluable position in respect to the moral welfare and strength of man. As such it becomes the self-conscious center of man to which revelation is addressed, by which it is comprehended. And the heart, actuated by the grace of God, disposes of the content of revelation.

It is the heart in man which responds to the will of God, first, as manifested by the patriarchs and prophets of the Old Testament; secondly, as is manifested by Jesus Christ and as operated upon by the Holy Spirit. So the heart stands between God and the whole spiritual life of man. The heart is the precise expression, therefore, for the moral character of man. Ps. 12:13: "With flattering lips and with a double heart do they speak," indicating an uncertain, unstable character. 1 Cor. 12:13: "And were not of a doubtful heart." 1 Sam. 10:9: "When he had turned his back to go from Samuel, God gave him another heart." Jer. 24:7: "And I will give thee a heart to know me, that I am Jehovah." Heb. 13:9: "Be not carried away with divers and strange teachings, for it is good that the heart be established by grace." 2 Peter 1:19: "As unto a lamp shining in a dark place, until the day dawn and the day-star arise in your hearts." Deut. 32:46: "Set your hearts unto all the words which I testify among you this day." Rom. 5:5: "Because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts," etc.

Well did the man of wisdom say in Prov. 4:23: "Keep thy heart with all diligence, for out of it are the issues of life;" and in Prov. 23:7: "As a man thinketh in his heart, so is he," also Rom. 10:10: "With the heart man believeth unto righteousness."

But since man is a free moral agent, the heart must naturally be the center from which proceeds the expression of this freedom. We have seen the part that it plays in the salvation and

moral uprightness of man. Equally as well is it the center from which proceed evil thoughts and deeds. It is the heart of flesh that lusteth against the spirit. We are told in Rom. 1:24, that God even ceases to work upon the heart: "Wherefore God gave them up in the lusts of their hearts unto uncleanness." Because of the presence of sin in the heart, God is represented as hardening the hearts of men. Ex. 9:35, 10:20, referring to the heart of Pharaoh; Eccl. 8:11: "Because sentence against an evil work is not executed speedily, therefore the heart of the sons of men is fully set in them to do evil." The heart, i. e., the unregenerated heart, is the fountain whence come forth evil thought, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, railings, these are the things which defile the man. With the heart man hates his brother. Lev. 19:17: "Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thine heart." Of a truth, out of the heart are the issues of a man's life.

VIII. THE HEART THE CENTER OF CONSCIENCE.

Thus far we have found no advance in the teachings of the heart. The conceptions up to this point are common to the Old and New Testaments alike. But there is one point of advance in the New Testament which is not distinctly taught in the Old Testament, that of conscience. That there are allusions to this faculty in the Old Testament cannot be denied, for man is there always treated as a moral being. The most direct passage which treats of the characteristic work of conscience, that of condemning wrong and approving right is found in Job 27:6: "My heart shall not (condemn) reproach me so long as I live."

That there should have been no doctrine of conscience among the Children of Israel is not due to the fact that they were lacking in psychological study and conception, but rather because the highest good had been revealed, and hence had precluded the question, to which conscience, by virtue of its constitution, is to give an answer. Plato's question, "What is the highest good?" had been answered for Israel in the law; the law is the will of God, hence the highest good was obedience to the law, which was written on tablets of stone in that dispensation, and not on the fleshy tablets of the heart.

Jesus himself, in his teachings, gave forth revelation largely which was intended to stir up individual self-consciousness of sin and of a sense of duty. He sought to find the hidden man of the heart and to make him a law unto himself by the light of revelation. So while Jesus sought to stir up conscience, he never taught a doctrine of it.

When his work as the Redeemer of the world had been accomplished, then the question of the highest good had been effectually answered. By His life and death He exhibited it and made it an actual power, within the reach of every man, without destroying his freedom. Then came the opportune time for the introduction of conscience into the affairs of men, that by its judgments of the facts of intellect, sensibility and will, resulting in a moral state, this highest good might be attained. It is conscience that impels a man to regard the law of justice and truth. Thus it becomes the legislature for a rational life. Being the discernor of moral principles, it impresses man's rational life with a definite personal conduct, while he at the same time preserves his freedom of choice.

On the other hand, personal conduct is placed side by side with the law of truth and righteousness, whereupon conscience declares whether such conduct is in harmony with the law of right, if so, then will there be a peaceful heart; if it is antagonistic to that law, then will there be an evil heart of unrest and unbelief. In this second aspect conscience becomes the tribunal of conduct.

Note furthermore, that conscience does not exist except as causal for right of choice, and for such choice it must be attached to intellectual and moral aspects of the soul. "To have a complete notion of our own moral being and attitude we must take conscience and reason together not only because they are directly given to us as one in the organism, but because they are united by a moral process. According to the teachings of the Bible, the heart presents this union in both aspects."

The development of the doctrine of conscience is left chiefly to the teachings of the disciples of Christ. St. Paul lays especial emphasis on attaining the highest possible good in life by seeking to have a conscience, "pure" and "void of offense."

The chief passage on this doctrine however, is found in Rom. 2:14, 15: "For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves; which show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the meanwhile accusing or else excusing one another." The thought herein contained is that men are responsible for their moral states and action whether Jew or Gentile, for God, who has committed to men the spiritual heritage of the race with the duty of guarding it and transmitting it, has also appropriately given a full revelation of the highest good in His Son. Man is a spiritual being and is susceptible of this revelation, and in the degree in which he becomes conscious of this revelation in things moral, is conscience rightly informed and consequently rightly supreme in its directions. The heart is the center for the conscience, the tribunal before which we are either acquitted or condemned. 1 Jno. 3:21: "Beloved, if our hearts condemn us not, then have we confidence towards God.

CONCLUSION.

From this brief review, it is obvious that the heart as spoken of in the Bible is the home of the soul, the common meeting place of all the inflowing influences of the great wide world without, and the center from which all the out-goings of man's self-conscious nature spring. Here the messages of sense and of God are transformed into finished products for health and the highest attainments. In its mysterious depths which God alone can fathom, lies the home of all we think and feel and will. Here our moral character is fashioned and confirmed by the law of conscience. Over it God's love broods until we open the door when He gladly enters and establishes there the law of the Spirit a living power by which we rise into sonship to God. Well may we, with all earnestness, pray the prayer of the Psalmist: "So teach us to number our days that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom."

ON THE DOCTRINE OF SCRIPTURE AND INSPIRATION.

ARTICLE VI.

BY REV. W. A. LAMBERT, B.A.

I. In the Seventeenth Century dogmatics, the doctrine of Scripture is treated in two places, from different standpoints: in the Prolegomena (or *Locus de scriptura sacra*, Gerhard) the Scriptures are considered as *principium cognoscendi*, in the *Locus de verbo divino* as *medium operandi*, or *medium vocandi*, *illuminandi*, *convertendi*. etc. (Hollaz, 992.)

II. The second is the original place for the treatment of the doctrine of the Word in Lutheran theology, under the heading, however, *de lege* and *de evangelio*... (Melancthon, *Loci*, 1521. Ed. Plitt-Kolde, 1900, pp. 110, 140, cf. Hase, *Hutterus Redivivus*, Sec. 118: "Die AKD haben die dgm. Behandlung dieses Bgr. [Wort Gottes] vernachlässigt, indem sie sich allein mit seinen einzelnen Gliedern *Lex. et Ev.* beschäftigten.")

III. The treatment of the doctrine *de scriptura sacra* is borrowed from the Scholastics and is in conflict with the doctrine as given in the *Locus de verbo divino*. According to the former, the Christian religion can be taught: (Hollaz, 41: *Ad capessendam religionem intellectus humanus, vi. verbi divini, et ex eo petitis argumentis stringentibus, logice atque interne cogi potest*); according to the latter, "the efficacy of the Word does not consist in moral persuasion" (Hollaz 992), but the "Word of God is a living thing, efficacious to produce spiritual effects" (Hollaz, 74, where an effort is made to reconcile the two views by at least placing them side by side in the Prolegomena.)

IV. The whole Prolegomena, with all the elements which necessitate the doctrine of Scripture as there given, are not reworked to harmonize with Reformation principles, and are not Protestant in tone or character. Cf. the definitions of *religion revelation* and *theology*, and note the absence of references to Luther and the frequency of references to the Scholastics, in the Prolegomena and in Gerhard's *Locus I.*

Cf. Köstlin, Art. *Religion*, PRE 2 12:644 f.; Kropatscheck, Das Schriftprinzip der lutherischen Kirche, I. Bd. 1904. This position is not contradicted by Weber's negative answer to the question, "ob die Arbeit der Orthodoxie prinzipiell einen Irrweg, ein Zurückbiegen in Katholische Scholastik bedeute." (Der Einfluss der prot. Schulphilosophie auf die orthodox lutherische Dogmatik, 1908, S. 173.)

V. The doctrine of the Scriptures as contained in the Prolegomena treats the Scriptures as source of knowledge, revelation as the making known of teachings or truths concerning God, rather than as the self-manifestation of God. This position was first developed in Jewish theology before N. T. times (Philo), exerted strong influence upon post-Apostolic writers, furnished the basis for the scholastic doctrine, and reached its fullest expression in Calov. It makes the Scriptures the real mediator between God and man, strives after knowledge of God rather than fellowship with God, is biblio-centric rather than Christo-centric. Cf. Cremer, Art. *Inspiration* PRE 3 9:183 ff.

VI. Any restatement and development of the doctrine from a Lutheran standpoint must start from the doctrine of the Word as Means of Grace, not from the conception of the Word as source of knowledge.

The latter conception is at best but a half-truth. In order to defend it and define it clearly, the dogmaticians must assume revelation=Holy Scripture, an assumption which they cannot fully justify. The definition of Gerhard: "Theologia (habitualiter et concretive considerata) est habitus *theosdotos* per verbum a Spiritu Sancto homini collatus" (p. 8) recognizes far more than the Scriptures alone as the source of theology, far more than is implied in the opening sentence of Locus I.: "Cum Scriptura Sacra sit unicum et proprium theologiae principium," etc. The latter agrees well enough with the other definition: "Theologia (systematice et abstractive considerata) est doctrina ex verbo Dei exstructa, qua homines in fide vera et vita pia eruduntur ad vitam aeternam" (p. 8), if it could be granted that an unregenerated man could be a good theologian, which, however, is denied by the definition itself. This second definition is given in somewhat different form by Hollaz: "Theologia, systematice et secundario spectata, est doctrina de Deo, hominem viatorem,

a verbo divino, de vero Dei per Christum cultu, ad vitam aeternam informans," (p. 7), which implies indeed that the Scriptures are the sole source of theology, but also that the doctrine suffices to teach man unto eternal life without any special working of the Holy Spirit. If the Scriptures are the sole source of theology, then the intellect of man can and must unaided draw from Scripture the knowledge of the saving truth; if man needs the illumination of the Holy Spirit, then this also is a source of theology, and Scripture is not the sole source of theology.

VII. The Word is a Means of Grace because it brings Christ to us; for herein lies the work of the Holy Spirit, that He through the Word unites us with Christ, who is our salvation. The power of the Word is the Christ who is revealed in it; as Luther expressed it: "Es treibet Christum." The Word is not grace, it is a means of grace; we find salvation not in it, but by means of it. And the salvation we find is not given in knowledge of God, but in fellowship with Christ. Christ is the power of God and the wisdom of God, (1 Cor. 1:24), Christ is the truth, the way and the life, (John 14:6), before the eyes of the Galatians Jesus Christ was openly set forth crucified (Gal. 3:1) Paul is "again in travail of them until Christ be formed in them" (Gal. 4:19). It is not knowledge, not wisdom, that St. Paul wishes to bring to men, but Christ, and Him crucified (1 Cor. 1:22-24); if the word of the cross is "unto us which are being saved the power of God," (1 Cor. 1:18), it is none the less Christ who is the power of God and the wisdom of God (1 Cor. 1:24.)

"Quoties Paulus optare se testatur fidelibus locupletem Christi cognitionem! Praevidebat enim fore, ut relictis salutaribus locis animos converteremus ad frigidas et alienas a Christo disputationes, itaque nos aliquam delineabimus eorum locorum rationem, qui Christum tibi commendent, qui conscientiam continent, qui animum adversus Satan erigant." (Melancthon, Loci, 1521. Ed. Kolde-Pliitt, p. 65). The heart of the Word is Christ, its efficacy comes from Christ—so it appears also to Luther and Melancthon.

VIII. Since Christ is the revelation of God, and revelation is not intellectual, not the making known of a doctrine, but per-

sonal, the making known of a person; and since the power of the Word lies in the fact that it brings Christ to us; the Scriptures are not only the record of the revelation, not only "die Geschichtsurkunde über die göttliche Offenbarung" (Rothe, *Zur Dogmatik*, p. 343), not only "Urkunde für den Vollzug der kirchengründenden Predigt." Kaehler, *Dogmatische Zief Fragen* 2I. 23), they are "das bekennende Zeugnis von der messianischen Gottesoffenbarung" (Kaehler I 2). "Offenbarungs-ansehen dürfen wir der Bibel beilegen, wenn sie uns Gottes Selbstoffenbarung in seinem Worte vermittelt." (Kaehler, I. 190). It is the record of the revelation completed, i. e., received by men. "Es treibet Christum," because it gives the first vivid experience of men with and in Him. (cf. Rothe, p. 280: "Und eben deshalb ist es so wichtig, dass der Erlöser zur unmittelbarsten persönlichen Gemeinschaft mit ihm gerade solche Männer berief, die an der eigentlichen Bildung ihrer Zeit so wenig Anteil hatten.")

The Word, therefore, is not simply a historical document, but a living power; it is the written Christ, or, more accurately, it is the written witness of men concerning that which Christ was and is for men and in men. This is true Revelation—something not outside of man, but something which from the outside has come into man. Cf. Simon, *Entwicklung und Offenbarung*, 1907, p. 54.

It dare not be overlooked that "Word of God" is not found only in the Scriptures, e. g. "Auch mit allen Klauseln, Umdeutungen und Einlegungen gilt die Gleichung: "Gottes Wort=Heilige Schrift" keine ausreichende Antwort auf die Frage: Was heisst das, der Prediger soll Gottes Wort predigen?..... Was wir bedürfen, ist eine inhaltliche Definition des göttlichen Wortes, die sowohl die Schrift, wie die Predigt unter sich befasst. "Was Christum treibet, das ist Gottes Wort," sagt Luther: Gottes Wort ist zu predigen, d. h. *Christus ist zu predigen*. Als Zeugnis von Christo ist die h. Schrift das Grundzeugnis göttlichen Wortes für die Christenheit.... Den in Christo, dem Gekreuzigten und Auferstandenen geoffenbarten Heilswillen Gottes als das Evangelium für alle Kreatur predigen zu Busse und Glauben, zur Liebe Gottes und der nächsten: das ist die Predigt der göttlichen Wortes." (Paul Kleinert, *Homiletik*, 1907, p. 43-45). "Word of God" is thus at the same time a

wider and a narrower term than "Holy Scripture." "Word of God" includes the preaching of all ages, in so far as it preaches Christ, it does not include whatever in "Holy Scripture" does not preach Christ.

IX. The Word is therefore Christ-filled, or Spirit-filled; the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of Christ, taking of Christ's and declaring it unto men, John 16:14; or God-filled, *theopneustos*, "the Word of God, living and efficacious in producing spiritual effects." (Frank, *Christliche Wahrheit*, II, 264.)

X. However the word *theopneustos* may be understood, whether *active*—God-breathing, or *passive*—God-breathed, in either case it denotes an attribute or quality of the Word, not a condition of the writers, nor a description of the mode of production: *pasa graphe theopneustos*, 2 Tim. 3:16.

For the meaning of *theopneustos* see Cremer, *Bibl. Theol. Wörterbuch* and PRE 3 9:184. Cremer maintains that philologically only the meanings "von Gott beatmet, von Gottes Geist erfüllt," or "Gottees Geist atmend" are possible, although Frank (*Wahrheit* II, 74) protests: "Es liegt nicht der leiseste sprachliche oder sachliche Grund von, mit Cremer von der hergebrachten Auffassung "inspirirt" abzugehen." Frank unfortunately bases his position purely upon an etymological possibility, not upon actual usage of the Word.

XI. Since the term *inspiration* is used as co-relative with revelation, and defined as "the subjective side of revelation" (Ladd, *Doctrine of Sacred Scriptures*), or the means and manner of revelation—always implying more or less that revelation is intellectual, an enlightening of the mind, rather than a personal contact with a person—it does not have the same connotation as *theopneustos*; and the adjective "inspired" has different meanings when applied to the writings and to the writers. An "inspired" writing is a writing produced under the influence of inspiration, an "inspired" man is not produced under the influence of inspiration, but is the object influenced by inspiration; or an "inspired" writing is *breathed* by God, an "inspired" man is *breathed into* by God. According to the A V the Holy Scriptures are "given by inspiration," the writers are not "given by inspiration," but receive by inspiration.

XII. We may therefore speak of the *theopneustia* of the

writings and of the *inspiration* of the men, thus keeping apart two distinct thoughts. But we must then not define *theopneustia*=*inspiration*, as the dogmaticians do. (cf. also Gausсен, *Theopneustie*-2 1842.)

XIII. The *theopneustia* of the writings is given directly in Christian experience and is correlative with the *authority* of the Scriptures. As the Christian knows himself dependent upon the Scriptures for his fellowship with God, he recognizes in Scripture God's voice speaking to him, i. e., the God-filledness of Scripture or its *theopneustia*... Cf. Gasser, *Das A. T. und die Kritik*, p. 133: "And this already is very worthy of note, that this unique literature [the O. T.], this inner experience of universal import and meaning, this soul-life, was given to the relatively small people of Israel which is almost lost among the old Oriental cultured states; this literature and life of which thousands on thousands among the most diverse peoples of earth have had to say again and again: these are *my* questions, *my* interests, *my* experience, *my* case, *my* sorrow, *my* joy, *my* striving, *my* rest, *my* sin, *my* folly, *my* worthlessness, *my* salvation, *my* hope, *my* wisdom, *my* strength,—*my* God!"

XIV. The *inspiration* of the writers of Scripture, or the fact that the Scriptures are given by inspiration, is gained by a deduction from the consciousness that what the Scriptures tell us of God was not learned by men themselves, but was made known to them by God. Only when this consciousness is developed in a man will the claim of the writers and the statements of the writings be accepted. The inspiration of the writers is therefore a deduction from the *theopneustia* of the writings—not *vice versa*, as the dogmaticians argue. Cf. however, Gerhard, *Locus I*, Cap. III, Sec. 36: "*Qui sunt in ecclesia, illi, sponte agnoscunt divinam Scripturae auctoritatem, eamque autopiston et axiopiston esse statuunt. Quo modo enim ecclesiae filii de veritate fundamenti, cui ecclesia innititur, dubitare poterunt? quomodo auctoritate verbi divini in Scripturis contenti possunt quaerere, qui vim et efficaciam verbi in corde suo ipsimet sentiunt, et per illud ad vitam aeternam sese regenitos esse agnoscunt?*"

XV. In the N. T. there is only one passage which mentions the *theopneustia* of Scripture [O. T.], but the entire usage of

the O. T. and the manner of quotation from it implies the theopneustia; there are a number of passages which speak of the inspiration of the writers, not however specifically as writers, but as preachers or heralds. The one exception to the latter statement, in the Book of Revelation, may be only apparent. John is commanded to write what is revealed to him; that he is inspired during the writing is not stated (Rev. 1:10 ff.). And what is revealed to him is no new truth concerning God, but warnings, instructions and prophecies to, for and concerning *men*.

XVI. None of the passages which speak of the inspiration of the writers give a description of the process, nor of the state of the subject of inspiration, nor of the character in detail of the result of inspiration.

(a) 2 Pet. 1:21: "No prophecy ever came by the will of man; but men spake from God, being moved by the Holy Ghost." The fact is here given: *how* the prophets were moved by the Holy Ghost is not here; and the fact is that of revelation, more than that of *inspiration*.

(b) John 14:26: "But the Comforter, even the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring to your remembrance all that I said unto you." Again the fact of a "being moved by the Holy Ghost," but no reference to the *how*, nor to the writing of "all things."

(c) 1 Cor. 2:10: "But unto us God revealed them through the Spirit;" a statement still more remote from the subject of inspiration, dealing directly with revelation.

(d) 1 Cor. 2:13: "Which things we also speak, not in words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Spirit teacheth." "But what are these 'things' of which St. Paul speaks? V. 9: "Things which eye saw not, and ear heard not, and which entered not into the heart of man, whatsoever things God prepared for them that love Him. But unto us God revealed them through the Spirit." Not, then, certainly, what the Biblical writers have read in the writings of others to whom they refer; *not* that of which they bear witness as eye witnesses, which they have seen, heard, touched; *not* whatever of fear and shame, joy and thanksgiving, gushed forth from their hearts; *not* that which God has placed before us all, like our world as we know it, with its rain and sunshine.....and what shall I say further?"

(Kachler, *Zeitfragen* I, 68). Again, therefore, we have the fact asserted, but not a word as to the manner, method or result; and the fact asserted only for a limited range of truths, not for all of Scripture.

XVII. Inspiration, according to these passages and the definition given by the theologians, (e. g.: "Inspiration is an action of the Holy Spirit, by which real knowledge of things is supernaturally poured upon a created intellect," Quenstedt, quoted in Schmid), belongs properly only to the strictly revealed truth contained in Scripture, not to the Scriptures as a whole, nor in all their parts. Theopneustia is a quality belonging to the Scriptures as a whole, is not restricted to any of its parts and is independent of the amount of supernatural revelation contained in any special portion. E. g. John 3:16 is from the standpoint of revelation—intellectually considered—more 'inspired' than Phil. 1:21, or Gal. 2:20; but measured by their God-filledness, their theopneustia, whether by this we mean their being God-breathed or their being God-breathing, these latter passages are by no means inferior. Measured by revelation as a personal fellowship with God, we might even consider them of greater value, embodying a clearer revelation of Christ. Again, the degree of inspiration in this sense varies greatly in St. Paul from the passages just quoted to 2 Tim. 4:13, but the theopneustia, being a quality of the writings as a whole, or, better yet, of the Bible as a whole, is not affected by such passages any more than the architectural beauty of a well-built house is affected by the rough rafters supporting its roof.

XVIII. Inspiration, especially in the sense of the dogmatists of the Seventeenth Century, belongs to the Scriptures as the source of theology, theopneustia belongs to the Scriptures as means of grace. Or, to retain the terminology of the dogmatists, inspiration belongs to the *Locus de scriptura sacra*, theopneustia to the *Locus de verbo divino*. Even in the dogmatists the two terms *Scriptura sacra* and *verbum divinum* are not synonymous. Gerhard, in a passage quoted above directly uses the phrase "*verbi divini in Scripturis contenti*." Hollaz writes: "*Sacra scriptura accurate loquendo est verbum Dei, idque vivum et efficax ad producendum effectus spirituales*," but in the very next question states: "*In definitione sacrae scripturae verbum*

Dei formaliter notat sententiam Dei, sive conceptum mentis divinae, de salute hominum immediate prophetis et apostolis, atque mediante eorum ministerion, universo generi humano manifestatum." (pp. 74 and 77.) It follows that a distinction must be made between *sacra scriptura* and *verbum Dei*, which one definition denies and the other necessitates. The attempt to substitute a definition for *Verbum Dei* in many places would lead to difficulties which are ignored by the simple assumption of Hol-laz's first definition, *Scriptura sacra = Verbum Dei*.

XIX. Since the modern development of thought, especially also of theological thought, does not admit the use of Scriptures as the sole source of theology; since in fact the Scriptures never were so *used*, but in the ancient Church the source of theology was the *regula fidei* drawn from the Scriptures, and in the dogmatics of the Seventeenth Century the *analogia fidei* was considered the key to the Scriptures, and both *regula fidei* and *analogia fidei* were the expression of Christian experience based upon and mediated by the Scriptures; it is not necessary to define inspiration in such a way as to make the Scriptures the absolute and sole, and therefore absolutely infallible source of theology. The sole source of theology is rather the Bible attested to and interpreted by Christian experience, or Christian experience bound up with the Bible and recognizing in it the personal God and personal Redeemer finding through the Bible and ultimately through the Bible alone access to God through Christ.

XX. The detail investigation of the means and manner of inspiration is therefore not essential to theology, and, in the absence of clear statements of Scripture and of experience, belongs to the speculative portion of theology, rather than to the positive. Christian experience and Christian knowledge are satisfied with the theopneustia of Scripture, the fact that in the Scriptures God is found, and with the assurance of Scripture and of experience, that it was God's Spirit who made it possible to find God in Scripture, not man himself; in other words, the double *fact*, not *theory*, of theopneustia and inspiration suffices.

XXI. If a theory of inspiration, i. e., of the mode in which God acted upon the writers of Scripture or of the condition of the writers during the writing, is to be formed, it must account not only for the theopneustia and the fact of inspiration, but

also allow for those parts of the *theopneustos graphe* which are not in the strict sense *inspired*, i.e., which contain no revelation, either intellectual or personal.

XXII. No theory can be true which distinguishes between the writing and the preaching of the apostles; since the only Scripture foundation for the doctrine deals not with the writing, but with speaking. The dogmaticians recognize the latter fact, but base upon it the argument *a minore ad majorem*: if God inspired the preaching how much more the writing, which was a permanent preaching?

XXIII. No theory can be true which mechanically distinguishes degrees and grades of inspiration in the same person during the same writing. This was granted by the dogmaticians, when they argued that the slightest details were truly inspired by the Holy Spirit.

XXIV. No theory can be true which treats revelation as the making known of formulated truth, and not as the making manifest of personal relations. "Die frühere orthodoxe, wesentlich scientifische Auffassung der Offenbarung als übernatürlicher Mitteilung von Kenntnissen, wie sie unter den Apologeten noch am meisten die Katholiken vertreten, betrachten wir (das Nähere der Dogmatik überlassend) als abgethan, besonders durch Rothe, "Zur Dogmatik." Die Erkenntnis ist erst Wirkung der an sich objektiven Offenbarung—Selbstkundthung Gottes." (Kübel, Apologetik, in Zöckler's Hand-buch, 3:309.)

XXV. No theory can be true which denies or ignores what the apostles claim, what Christ promises and what the Christian experiences—the indwelling of the Holy Spirit in man, the dwelling of man in God and of God in man.

XXVI. It seems most satisfactory to regard the Bible, the N. T. more particularly, as the work of the Holy Spirit dwelling in men, in which work the men wrote out of the fulness of their own life and thought what through the Holy Spirit's guidance they had learned, felt and thought, so that the writings are in the most real sense their work, and yet, according to St. Paul's word: "no longer theirs, but Christ's in them." Cf. John 1:14; 15:27; 1 John 1:1-4; Gal. 2:20.

XXVII. Such a theory does not make the writings less human nor less divine than the fact of *theopneustia* and the other

fact of inspiration require; and it avoids the dualism of a two-fold irreconcilable authorship, by the human writers on one hand and by the divine Spirit on the other.

XXVIII. Such a theory fully accounts for all the peculiarities of the writings, allows for the human history of their transmission, without in any way disparaging their truly divine character and influence.

XXIX. Such a theory accords with all the methods of divine work, since God universally works through men as living personalities, not as mere intellects nor as mere impersonal tools; permitting them of their own human weakness to add their personal marks to what He does, but also so overruling these personal marks that His work is not hindered. The few apparent exceptions are clearly marked as such, e. g., Balaam and Caiaphas; in both instances, however, the men speak their true mind, and in their own personalities, in the one case compelled by God's appearing, in the other intending something entirely different, and speaking that something different clearly and directly, yet in such wise that the words have another meaning as well, of which the speaker is unconscious. Any other exceptions we might think of, belong entirely to the extraordinary and temporary, almost momentary, and do not fit the case of prophets or historians or psalmists, of evangelists or writers of letters.

XXX. Such a theory also accords with God's method of dealing with men in other matters. He nowhere gives men finished truth, but everywhere the elements out of which they must spell the truth. He has given man His reason also to find out God, not to abuse it nor to leave it unused. When God gives man experience, He leaves him to interpret and to record that experience; God does not do man's work for him. So also in the Scriptures; God has left men, filled with His Spirit, in full sympathy with Him, to record their experience with Christ, and this record of Christ in their experience brings to us the Christ of Christian experience, the true revelation of God in Christ. Hence He can also leave the interpretation of the Scriptures to men, who shall also have His Spirit in them, through whose guidance they shall find His meaning in Scripture. Had God intended to give men finished truth in Scripture, it must be the judgment of any man who has glanced at but a few commentaries, or a few systems of

theology, that God had not accomplished His purpose—the natural inference from which would be that there is no God back of Scripture; God the Omnipotent would not have failed. The alternative is simply that God did not intend to give man in Scripture an infallible statement of truth any more than He intended to give man an infallible system of astronomy in the stars.

XXXI. Since *theopneustia* is an attribute of the Scriptures as they are used, it is independent of questions of textual and literary criticism, and is by Christian experience posited of the Scriptures not in their original form only, but in the form in which we have them, whether in translation, or in original text or in critically restored text, or even in paraphrase or sermon; it is an attribute not of *words*, but of the *Word*. . . Or, to return again to the dogmatists, *theopneustia* belongs to the *sensus divinus*, the *sententiam Dei, sive conceptum mentis divinae, de salute hominum*, (— in which terms however the intellectualism must be noted, overshadowing the personal character of revelation —), not to the *materia ex qua, litterae et voces*, of which the dogmatists hold, however, that they are *divinitus dictatae*. (Hollaz, p. 77.)

XXXII. Since inspiration is a deduction from *theopneustia* and from the fact of a personal revelation guaranteed by the *theopneustia*, it also is independent of question of textual and literary criticism. The argument must read: "No prophecy ever came by the will of men; but men spake from God, being moved by the Holy Ghost" (2 Pet 1:21); "in these writings we have prophecy; therefore the writers were moved by the Holy Ghost;" not: "these men were moved by the Holy Ghost, therefore their writings are prophecy."

XXXIII. Since *theopneustia* and inspiration are independent of textual and literary criticism, the latter can and must solve its problems independently of both *theopneustia* and inspiration; and errs only when it presumes to deny these, or to claim that these are dependent upon its results. When it makes such a claim, it is in error, whether it denies or supports the *theopneustia* and inspiration, i. e., whether the criticism is negative or conservative. If the criticism is negative, its argument amounts to this: These writings cannot have the power ascribed

to them and exerted by them in Christian experience, because it is possible to point out time, place and person concerned in their production; as much as if a man insisted that a keg of powder had no explosive power within it, because he could point out the factory in which it was made! If the criticism is conservative, the argument implies, that if the writings had not been produced by certain men at a given time, they could not have the power ascribed to them; i. e., the God-filledness belongs not to the writings as such, but to certain conditions of their origin;—an argument constantly contradicted by experience, and equal to the argument: unless this keg of powder was made by such a man in such a given factory on such a day, it cannot explode. A false label on the keg will not prevent the powder from shattering the doubter, nor will it add force to the explosive for him who believes the label.

XXXIV. Since theopneustia and inspiration are independent of textual and literary criticism, the latter are not indispensable, nor are they every man's business, nor are they essentially theological studies. Textual and literary criticism are branches of philological and historical study, which belong to theological study only because they concern the Bible in which the theologian has so vital an interest. They are of direct importance to the theologian only in so far as they affect exegesis, i. e., the interpretation of the Bible. When the clear meaning of the Word of God can be determined without the knowledge of variations in the text and of the circumstances of the writer, textual and literary criticism are a burden, not a help to the theologian.

XXXV. On the other hand, simply because both theopneustia and inspiration are independent of textual, literary and historical criticism, the positive results of criticism can and must, after due testing on critical—not dogmatic, whether conservative or negative—grounds, be accepted by the theologian, and provided for his theories and doctrines. With the unproved hypotheses and suggestions of critics he has nothing whatever to do, except to burden his memory with them, in order not to be thought unscholarly.

XXXVI. The fundamental misconception which has led to a false view of inspiration, the confusion of theopneustia with inspiration and an exaggerated importance ascribed to criticism

on both positive and negative sides, is the valuation of the Scriptures as a legal codex, of Christianity as a new Law, implying an ignorance of the Gospel, and the old error of work-righteousness, although it may be only the work-righteousness of infallible teaching, of having the truth more than other men; and, on the negative side, the desire to escape the bondage to a Law felt to be oppressive, the Law which requires belief,—belief being mistaken for faith. Cf. Herrmann, *Communion with God*, closing chapter.

ARTICLE VII.

THE NEW THEOLOGY.

BY PROFESSOR JOHN O. EVJEN, PH.D.

The New Theology, by R. J. Campbell, M.A., Minister of the City Temple, London. (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1907. Pp. VII, 258 Price \$1.50 net.)

What has of late come to be known as New Theology is associated with the Rev. Campbell more than with any other theological writer. Not that he invented the name or the thing, for both were in existence before Mr. Campbell ever preached a sermon. The thing came from the Rationalists. But it is not known where or when the name was first used. (1) Fifty years ago there was a theology in the American Lutheran Church nicknamed "new theology," but it had nothing in common with that of Mr. Campbell. The discussions in England going under the name of new theology are of recent date, referring, as they do, to the religious line of thought of which Mr. Campbell is the special sponsor. On the European continent we hear but little about "new theology," the term "modern" being preferred to "new." Modern theology is generally accepted as synonymous with negative theology. But there is also a modern theology that is, or claims to be, positive: the movement inaugurated by Prof. Seeberg of Berlin, and supported by Prof. Grützmacher of Rostock and Prof. Beth of Vienna. There is no reason why "modern" should be the adjectival prerogative of the Radicals, for what is modern may very well be positive. To bring out the negative moment, "new" is perhaps the better word. Mr. Campbell has likely made no mistake in selecting his adjective, though it is far from being adequate; for his theology is old and decrepit, a bald rationalism that has only a remote connection with sober modern religious thought. This, by way of anticipation, may be said at the start of our discussion.

(1) It has been said that Ritschl in Germany is the father of modern theology. Ritschl, however, disavowed the name, which, moreover, was used in Holland before in Germany.

In the following, we will seize upon some of the salient points in our author's theology, using so far as possible, his own words. His ideas regarding God and Christ, sin and atonement, prophecy and the authority of Scriptures, retribution, Church and orthodoxy, are so pronounced that it requires no effort to select such quotations as will, even in themselves, give us a fair idea of his theology, method and scholarship. To refute Mr. Campbell, beyond quoting and passing a few opinions, will not be necessary. Much of what he says is too crude or too naive to deserve express refutation. To do him no injustice, it must, however, be said that his book has its charms on the language side, and that Mr. Campbell himself can, no doubt, be classified as one who possesses not a few of those things which go to make up a magnetic personality. He is, in more than one way, sympathetic. It is his theology that is objectionable.

Says he: "God is the mysterious Power which is finding expression in the universe and which is presented in every tiniest atom. It was this Power that produced Jesus. When I look at Jesus I say to myself, God is that, and, if I can only get down to the truth about myself, I shall find I am that too....God is all; He is the Universe and infinitely more....The Universe is God's thought about Himself...The surface self of....Smith, his Philistine self, is the incarnation of some portion of that eternal self which is one with God....My God is my deeper self and yours too; He is the Self of the Universe and knows all about it....When our finite consciousness ceases to be finite, there will be no distinction whatever between ours and God's."

Mr. Campbell's Pantheism—and the above is nothing but that—naturally makes God responsible for evil. "Nothing finite can exist without evil....Good is being, and evil is not-being... Evil is necessary in order that we may know that there is such a thing as good....'The Devil is a vacuum'....The doctrine about the Fall is an archaic untenable notion....The Genesis myth about Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden forms the background of it....The Genesis narrative says nothing about the ruined creation or the curse upon posterity....It is a composite primitive story. More than one account of the event has been drawn upon to supply material for the narrative as it now stands....The Genesis story of the Fall exercised no influence

upon the O. T. religion.... It is doubtful whether Paul took the Genesis story literally or not, certainly Milton did not.... The doctrine of the Fall is an absurdity from the point of view both of ethical consistency and common sense.... Modern science knows nothing of it.... The Fall theory is a hindrance to religion."

In his conception of Christ, Mr. Campbell is a Unitarian. He is at one with radical theology in proclaiming the uniqueness of Jesus, and does not hesitate to affirm that "Christianity without Jesus is a world without sun.... It is no use trying to place Jesus in a row along with other religious masters.... He is the first and the last nowhere, we have no category for Him." In the light of Mr. Campbell's own thinking, however, these statements are unwarrantable. The material that he brings to the market is too weak to support such Christology. We get an idea of its strength in statements like the following: "The human and the divine are two categories which shade into and imply each other; humanity is divinity viewed from below, divinity is humanity viewed from above.... If any human being could succeed in living a life of perfect love, he would show himself as divine, for he would have revealed the innermost of God. In a sense—everything is divine, because the whole universe is an expression of the being of God." "Gen. Boöth is divine" in so far "as the principle of love is the governing principle of his life.... Jesus was divine simply and solely because His life was never governed by any other principle.... But the term Deity cannot be applied to Jesus, for He did not possess the all-contributing consciousness of the universe.... Present-day Unitarianism is preaching with fervor and clearness the foundation-truth of the New Theology, the fundamental unity of God and man—" (Mr. Campbell objects to being called a Unitarian just as much as he denies he is a Pantheist) "Jesus was God, so are we.... He was the child of Joseph and Mary.... The virgin birth is not demonstrable from Scriptures.... The fourth Gospel—the work of several—ignores the belief in the virgin birth.... The famous passage 'Behold a virgin shall conceive and bear a son and shall call his name Immanuel' has nothing to do with the virgin birth of Christ.... The prophecy here indicated was only the shrewd common sense of a wise and patriotic man

who loved his country and believed in God....Expert scholarship has been saying it for a long time....The genealogies in Matthew and Luke are inconsistent with each other....The nativity stones belong to the poetry of religion."

The atonement is disposed of in the same off-hand way. We are told that "psychologically the idea of atonement takes precedence of the idea of sin ...The root principle of atonement is not that of escaping punishment for transgression, but the assertion of the fundamental oneness of God and man [at-onement]....The sense of sin is not essential to atonement.... Atonement is never an equivalent for penalty. The Pauline, Petrine, and Johanine theories and that of one writer to the Hebrews are not naturally consistent, and Paul is not always consistent with himself....What has the death of Jesus effected in the unseen so as to make it possible for God to forgive us? Nothing whatever and nothing was ever needed....But in what sense is the death of Jesus a satisfaction to the Father? In no sense at all, except that the sacrifice of Jesus is the highest expression of the innermost of God that has ever been made.... Institutional, forensic, external, the atonement never has been and never will be....There is no justification except by becoming just and no imputed righteousness which means availing ourselves of merits that are not ours....The noble fifty-third of Isaiah has nothing whatever to do with Jesus."

It will be seen from the above dicta that Mr. Campbell cares very little for the opinion of the Biblical writers. Especially does he seem to be fond of combating St. Paul. "Paul's opinion on the atonement is simply Paul's opinion and not necessarily a complete and adequate statement of truth....According to Paul, the wages of sin were actually and literally death. But for sin there would have been no death, and to break the power of sin would also be to break the power of death....But in this Paul was wrong....The juridical and the ethical elements in Paul's teaching stand in irreconcilable contrast....His theology is saved by his mysticism." Mr. Campbell also corrects what he thinks is Paul's view of the resurrection: "True resurrection is spiritual, not material....No doubt primitive Christians naively regarded heaven as a place above the sky to which the physical body actually went. Plainly enough this is what

Paul thought about it, but such a conception is now impossible to any one; it could only exist under a geocentric view of the universe, which has long since passed away.... Paul's theory as to resurrection of every physical body is just nonsense in the light of our knowledge of the universe and its laws."

As to eternal judgment Mr. Campbell asks, "Who pray is the judge? Who but yourself?.... The deeper self is the judge, the self who is eternally one with God. You are the judge; you in God.... Death, judgment, heaven, and hell cannot properly be regarded as the Last Things.... They are all here now, here within the soul, just as infinity and eternity are here now.... It is not a matter of hither and yonder but of higher and lower.... Belief in the atoning merits and the finished work of a Saviour will not compensate for wasted opportunities and selfish deeds; the latter will light the fires of retribution as the soul awakens to the true condition and then will the indwelling Christ obtain His opportunity."

In Mr. Campbell's system of theology there is no room for faith or the Holy Ghost. He has also very little use for the dogma, the institutional Church, and the theologian: "The Dogma is doing nothing to save the world.... Much of the moral earnestness of the nation and of social redemptive efforts exists outside of the Church. Religion is necessary to mankind, but Churches are not. The world is not listening to the theologians to-day. They have no message for it. They are on the periphery, not at the center of things. Popular Christianity (or rather pulpit theological Christianity) does *not* interpret life."

* * * * *

The English speaking world has long been busy in "sizing up" the Rev. Campbell and his New Theology. A writer in the "Nation," evidently a theologian, has given a very good estimate of both. He says: "There is not much in the book to justify the acute alarm or intense admiration with which it has been alternately regarded. Principal Fairbairn has delicately hinted at Mr. Campbell's deficient training in the subject he discusses. This is manifest in every chapter. He attacks the oldest and toughest problems of theology and metaphysics, and

has his little offhand solution for each one.... This is the courage of conviction, no doubt, but it is also the *courage of ignorance*. (2) An eminent theologian, himself very liberal minded, says about Mr. Campbell's book that it is a 'farrago of nonsense.' It is something more than that on the human and religious side, but it is also philosophically very weak. Indeed where Mr. Campbell's New Theology is not merely old heresy, it is too much of a thing of shreds and patches."

A similar estimate, though more from the philosopher's point of view, is given by Newton Marshall (M.A., London University; Ph.D., Halle.) in the "Expositor." He characterizes Mr. Campbell's methods and tendencies as irrelevant: his method is faulty, his results wrong. Higher criticism, social science, and natural science are for Mr. Campbell nothing but names to conjure with. After giving many pages to the philosophical side of Mr. Campbell's theology, Dr. Marshall arrives at the conclusion, that the author of the New Theology "has no remotest notion of what modern science means.... I say this without any reservation. If there is one thing which the author of the New Theology has quite neglected to master it is the scientific method." Mr. Campbell may call his New Theology an 'untrammelled return to the Christian sources.' It is, however, nothing but 'untrammelled reliance upon intellect.' He recommends for Mr. Campbell's intellectual improvement the reading of some of the philosophical works of Karl Pearson or Riehl; of Schiller or Oxford; and of James or Harvard. It is, he claims, not sufficient to build, as Mr. Campbell does, "on the theological speculations of scientists such as are embodied in Sir Oliver Lodge's interesting little ventures called the 'Substance of Faith.'"

We heartily endorse these criticisms. The "New Theology" may be the favorite classic of the emancipated woman, or the fetish of the dissatisfied Church-goer. To the scientific mind, however, it can be nothing but the work of a theological charlatan. In Germany, where every contribution to the science, no matter in what language, is scrutinized, dissected, and judged as soon as it appears, Mr. Campbell's book has not, to our knowledge, been deigned any notice. In England, however, it has

(2) *Italics mine.*

had another fate. Prof. Sanday in his new work: *The Life of Christ in Recent Research*, 1907, referring to the movement started by the "New Theology," says: "Now they [the discussions] are upon us, and upon us in a flood; and, even though the waters may subside, the face of the landscape will never quite be what it was again. The circumstances were just the kind that in this country makes more impression upon the mass of the public in a few weeks than the quiet work of retired students in as many months and even years. This is just the unfortunate part of it. Publicity with us means so much publicity. It means rallying cries and the forming of party organizations, and propaganda—very often before it is all clear what is sought to propagate. A movement is forced on, and clamour arises, and the issues are soon confused in the strife of tongues. . . . The misfortune is that it [New Theology] is thrust before the public long before it has been really thought out. And the point on which it seems to me to need the greatest amount of further thinking is in regard to the relation between the old and the new. There is much in the principle that lies behind the movement that may be right enough and true enough in its proper place and degree. But then it is stated with exaggeration, and with a lack of proportion and the necessary qualifications which jars the Christian conscience. While it is true that the effort after theological restatement is widespread, including as I believe many who are anxious to maintain a full continuity with the Christian faith in its historical expression, I should like to put in a word of warning against the idea that this effort has yet attained to anything like a completely satisfactory formulation. . . . Nothing but harm will come from raising our peans too soon. Let us maintain the modest attitude of seekers, and in particular not be in a hurry to sally forth into the streets to teach until we have learnt our own lesson, and made sure that we have learnt it well."

There are some commendable things said in the first chapter of Mr. Campbell's book, and the attendant promises have something of an inspiration, but the remaining fifteen chapters fail entirely in making these promises good. They reveal the utopian spirit of the whole program. It is Mr. Campbell's misfortune that he has been doing (if we accept his statements) too

much of his own thinking. In the preface he says, "I do not see why a man should be ashamed of confessing that he does his own thinking instead of letting other people do it for him;" in the conclusion, "I am not conscious of owing a scintilla of my theology to any living man." This naive attitude to theological research, the work of thousands of busy minds is indeed characteristic. It explains the inglorious failure of Mr. Campbell to make an impression on the theological circles proper.

Mr. Campbell alludes to the existence of a New Theology in America, in England, and in France. But Germany is ignored, the country from which he has, perhaps subconsciously, got almost all his theology even though he did get it in shreds and patches. Of Germany's progressive conservative theology he seems to know nothing: he hears and sees everywhere the victorious approach of modern theology, forgetful of the fact that this theology is now being attacked by sane and sober scholarship as never before. A perusal of E. Müller's *Die neuesten zeugnisse der theol. Universitätslehrer gegen die radikale Theologie*" (see LUTHERAN QUARTERLY, July 1907, 351 f.) goes to prove this. Further proof is given in the excellent series of pamphlets called "*Biblische zeit-und Streitfragen*" (counteracting the radical "*Religionsgeschichtliche Volksbücher*") and in "*Die Theologie der Gegenwart*" (counteracting the radical "*Theologische Rundschau*"). Again might be mentioned the modern-positive theology. Add to this Lic. Schiele's criticism of Harnack's peace message ("Observer," Oct. 25, '07; reprinted in "The Bible Student and Teacher," Dec. 1907) and it will become evident that the modern liberal theology is so far from becoming the master of the situation that it is steadily losing ground.

Dr. Marshall has already pointed out in the *Expositor* that Mr. Campbell "has no remotest notion of what modern science means." The writer in the "Nation" speaks of the author's "courage of ignorance." And Dr. Sanday, though less direct, is not one that spares the rod. The philosophic acumen of Mr. Campbell has certainly been reduced to its proper level. A word might be added as to his "historisches Empfinden" and historical scholarship.

It is a requisite of the historian to comprehend in all its signi-

ficance the distinction between myth and legend. For instance, Strauss' "Life of Jesus," which made the miracles mere myths, or purposeless poetical traditions, is an unscientific work, if for no other reason, than for the fact that mythmaking is possible only in certain centuries. If the age in which Christ entered into the world, or the nineteenth century were capable of producing myths, then men like Caesar and Bismarck would have come in for a good share of them. As it is, we have no myths about Caesar or Bismarck. We have anecdotes and, perhaps, legends, but these have very little in common with the myth. Mr. Campbell is not aware of the distinction. To him the creation narrative is a myth, also a legend. And he posits the nativity stories in the region of "poetry of religion," and still calls them legends. He "traces" the "legend" of the virgin birth back to Babylonian myth! Through this "tracing" we also learn that a millenium is no obstacle to Mr. Campbell. His imagination, somehow or other, manages to strike upon a missing link and give birth to phantastic combinations, "results" of "expert scholarship," as he calls it. That is the case in his handling the ancient documents. But when he takes up those of our own times, his critical attitude becomes one of credulity. There are things that the scientific historian rejects as legends, but which Mr. Campbell accepts as historical facts. He has no doubt about Julian the Apostate's crying, "Thou hast conquered, O Galilean!" and he believes with wholehearted simplicity the story about Arnold Winkelried's heroic words and action in the battle of Sempach! The rudiments of historical criticism would have taught him otherwise. The idea to stamp the nativity stories and the miracles as legends, and to pass as genuine mint the legendary words of a Roman emperor and a Swiss soldier! Mr. Campbell's purpose in quoting the soldiers is to show the weakness of Paganism and the power of Christianity. We commend the purpose. But why substitute impeachable testimony for what is unimpeachable?

Another proof of the author's manner of interpreting history is shown in his claim that the mood of the age in which Christianity had its beginnings is reflected in the pages of Juvenal. No doubt this is the popular idea. But the historian objects to this. It is only a few years ago since one of Germany's most

celebrated historians discussed this very idea. Juvenal, he said, concerned himself mainly about Rome, but a large city can never reflect the life of a nation; and a satirist furnishes exceedingly untrustworthy material for history, since he always exaggerates.

Our author is likewise careless in quantitative judgments. It is astonishing to hear him tell us that "Wesley has created the largest Protestant denomination in the world." What about the Lutherans, a body, in numbers, four times as strong? Again, when we are told that from the beginning of the second century onwards, "the fathers of the Church... attempted a variety of explanations of the way in which the death of Jesus achieved potentially the redemption of mankind", we cannot refrain from asking who these fathers were. History of Dogma knows nothing of such fathers, at least in the first half of the second century. The apostolic fathers fail to give us any distinctive conception, or original religious apprehension of the death of Christ.

Mr. Campbell's historical sense, therefore, appears to occupy the same level as his philosophical talents. This is unfortunate; for the author of the *New Theology* should be above the charge of dillentantism especially in the fields of historical and systematic theology,—the more so, since Mr. Campbell is a dogmatist of the first water. Where the conservative theologians say "yes" Mr. Campbell comes with his sweeping "no." This use of sweeping negatives, unsupported by facts, may appeal to a certain class of individuals and procure a large following, but it is no particular sign of intellectual strength or originality. Mr. Campbell's dogmas have no foundation in Scripture or in science. They may continue yet for a while to be the creed of a large and enthusiastic band of followers, but the time will come when these, too, will think as did the two Englishmen who set out to bear testimony against the authors of premature theologies. Mounting a long ladder they inscribed over the portico of Mr. Campbell's church, a word in staring white letters a foot and a half high: "Ichabod."

We close with a word from Dr. Sanday: "The pity of it is that, if I understand the *New Theology* rightly, its advocates might have all they want—or at least all that they *ought* to want, which is not perhaps quite the same thing—without any real disturbance of the greater landmarks of Christianity." This

means that Mr. Campbell's theology can be detached from what is really practical in his program, for there is no organic unity between his theological theories and his sociological measures. The author's aims are really more sociological than theological. We should not be in the least surprised to see a New Sociology fathered upon him. Be this as it may, the New Theology needs a revision.

ARTICLE VIII.

THE MAKING OF THE MINISTER: A SYMPOSIUM.

I.

BY JACOB A. CLUTZ, D.D.

This is a perennial subject. It is as old as the Church itself, and it will no doubt last as long as the Church needs men to minister in her pulpits and at her altars. While it is old, therefore, it is also ever new. Each age gives it a fresh interest and significance because it considers it from its own stand-point, and in the light of its own special needs and demands.

In beginning a discussion of it from the standpoint of the present day, two general remarks can be made.

The first is, that our views concerning the making of the minister will be determined largely by our conception of the minister himself. The more complex a machine is the more difficult it will be to manufacture it. The making of a wheelbarrow is a comparatively simple matter because it is a simple piece of mechanism. It will not require much time, and the task may be entrusted to almost any kind of a workman skilled or unskilled. It is a vastly different thing to make a chronometer, or a Hoe printing press, or a Baldwin locomotive. The proper making of these will require considerable time, and the most carefully trained workmen and the most delicate machinery.

If we think of the minister simply as a man who is to shine in society, or to perform certain religious rites and ceremonies, or to administer sacraments, and to deliver pleasant little homilies on moral and religious themes, then the preparation of him for his work may seem a very simple thing, requiring neither much time nor great care, and almost any young man who is good-looking, and has a fair amount of common sense may be regarded as good raw material for the work. But if we think of the minister as first of all, and chief of all, a prophet of God whose business it is to discover God's truth, and His message to a sinning and sorrowing world, and then to deliver that message in such

a way that men will be constrained to listen to it, whether they heed it or not; if we remember that in addition to this he is to be a priest, ministering at the altar of worship, leading the congregation in their devotions, and administering to them the sacraments; that he is also to be a pastor, going in and out of the homes of his people and ministering to them there in joy and in sorrow, in sickness, in suffering, in adversity, in bereavement and death, and seeking to apply the truth to each individual heart and in each peculiar experience; that in these days especially he is expected also to be a man of affairs, a leader and administrator, an organizer and director of societies, who shall at least keep his hand on a great multitude of social and religious activities of many different kinds; that in many cases he is also expected to be a wise counsellor and a skillful leader in moral and social and civic reforms, and in everything that looks to the improvement of society, the adjustment of the relation between the classes and masses, the adoption of better business methods, and a more honest and righteous administration of law—when we remember all this, then we must come to feel that the work of the ministry is one of the greatest and most difficult tasks to which men are now called, that only the best men in every sense of the word are fitted to undertake it, and that the preparation of them for their work must be correspondingly difficult and serious.

The second general remark is, that the making of a minister is a continuous process which neither begins nor ends with his course of study in a theological seminary. Indeed, it might be said of the true minister, as of a genuine poet, that he is born, not made. A young man must come to the seminary with certain natural endowments and capabilities, as well as with certain preliminary training, and unless he is possessed of these no seminary in the land, and no faculty of professors, no matter how able, can ever make of him an acceptable and efficient minister.

The making of the minister continues, or should continue, long after he leaves the seminary. Brave soldiers and great commanders are not made at West Point, neither are captains of battleships, and commodores of fleets made at Annapolis. Young men are given a certain technical training in these na-

tional schools of war which fits them, in a measure, for their future work, but this training in the schools must be supplemented by experience in the camp and on the field, or on the sea, and in actual warfare, before they are really fitted for their work.

It is just so with the minister, and as long as he is in the ministry the work of development and improvement should continue. When once a minister is really made, finished, so that he ceases to grow, his work is done. Then he would better stop, and quit the work. He has reached the true "dead line" and the only "dead line" which any man in the ministry should fear, or any congregation should recognize.

We hear a good deal, too much, about the "dead line" drawn by advancing years. When a man has passed forty years of age he begins to be discounted by many Churches. When he has passed fifty they will have nothing to do with him at all. They may tolerate him for a few years more, if he is their pastor, but they would never think of giving him a call, if vacant. This is a purely artificial "dead line" which ought never to have been drawn, and ought never to be recognized by any congregation. The minister should be at his best, not when he is twenty-five or thirty years of age, but when he is fifty or sixty, not when he leaves the seminary a mere theological fledgling, but after years of experience and development in the work. The true minister will be.

The real "dead line" is the time at which a minister ceases to grow, to improve, to become better acquainted with his work and better prepared and better able to do it. This time is not a matter of age at all. At least it is not necessarily so. Some men reach it very early in their ministry, some never reach it at all, though they may live to three score years and ten, or even to four score years. Some men reach it the moment they turn their backs on the seminary and pass out from under the hands of "tutors and governors," with their required tasks and regular schedule of study and recitations. Others keep up their study and work, and keep on growing, until the Master says, "It is enough, come up higher." These last are always making, never fully made, and this is the true ideal.

No doubt, however, it was the intention, in arranging for this

symposium on "The Making of the Minister," that the discussion should have to do largely with the work done in the theological seminary. This is after all the place where, broadly speaking, ministers are made, just as doctors are made in the college of medicine, and lawyers in the law school, and engineers in an engineering school, &c. That is, it is in these professional schools that young men receive the special, technical training which is intended to fit them at least to begin work in their several professions.

There has been much criticism, in recent years, of these schools of the prophets, and of the work done in them. They have been called medieval, old-fogy, impracticable, &c. Probably some of the criticism is deserved, but certainly not all of it.

In some seminaries, the courses of study and the methods of work are somewhat antiquated. They have not kept pace with the advances made in other educational institutions. Too much time may be spent in acquiring, or in a vain attempt to acquire, a working knowledge of the original languages in which the Scriptures were written. Too much stress may be laid on mere text-book study and recitations. Too little effort may be given, and this little not always very wisely, to training the young men in the art of public speaking, so that they may be able not only to prepare good sermons, but also to deliver them acceptably and effectively. There may be a lack of needed instruction and discipline in practical affairs, in the administrative work of the pastor, so much of which now falls to the lot of the minister in the average congregation especially in the cities and larger towns. All this may be true.

On the other hand it may be a good thing that our seminaries should be a little slow in making the changes called for by such criticism, and in taking up with the various fads of modern pedagogy and what are called university methods. Some of these have hardly been sufficiently tested, as yet, to know whether they are wise or not. Let them be thoroughly tried and proved elsewhere before they are adopted in the seminary. It may turn out that in many cases the old will after all be found better than the new.

Moreover, it must ever be remembered that our seminaries have to deal with men, and not with machines, with minds and

spirits and not with dead matter. Hence not too much must be expected from them. Due allowance must be made for the personality and the individuality of the students. In a factory where watches and clocks are made, or sewing machines, or printing presses, or electric engines, it may be possible to turn out a thousand, or ten thousand, practically exactly alike, and every one a perfect specimen of its kind. But this is impossible in a school of any grade or character. It is impossible even in the common schools, though it is often attempted there, and the teachers seem to be expected to accomplish it. It is impossible in all the higher schools, and especially in the professional schools.

The seminaries do as good work, we believe, as any other professional schools. The facts would probably show that they do better work, that a larger percentage of the graduates of theological seminaries enter the ministry and are fairly successful in it, than is true of the graduates of any other class of technical or professional schools with reference to the special lines of work for which they have been fitted.

Sometimes it is said that when young men leave the seminary, and enter the actual work of the ministry, they must at first unlearn much of what has been taught them, before they can really begin to do their work comfortably and successfully. This, however, is seldom true. A young man may have misunderstood much of his teaching, and he may need to correct these misunderstandings. He may have drawn many false inferences from what he has been taught, and he may need to revise these. But the chief thing he has to learn is to translate theory into practice, to use skillfully and effectively the weapons which have been placed in his hands. This, however, is no fault of the seminary. It grows out of the very nature of the case. The seminary is not to be blamed for this any more than the parent bird is to be blamed because its young must learn to fly after leaving the nest.

Without entering into any minute discussion of the course of study in the seminary, or of the work of training to be done there, there are three things which the seminary ought to aim at, and which it may reasonably be expected to do.

First it should help a young man to find himself, to know

what his gifts and capabilities are, what he can do and what he should try to do. This is a very important matter, and is really more important to a candidate for the ministry than to a candidate for any other profession or career. It is one of the most valuable services which a theological seminary can possibly render to its students.

For lack of just this thing, or because it has not been faithfully and fearlessly done, or because its results have not been accepted and acted on, many a man has entered the ministry, and has gone stumbling and falling all through life, attempting the impossible and necessarily failing in it, and thereby making himself unhappy, and proving a burden to the Church instead of a workman not needing to be ashamed.

Some men should never be admitted to the seminaries at all. They are so manifestly unfitted for the work of the ministry that the doors should be closed to them, kindly but firmly. Some are admitted to the seminaries who should never be permitted to go through. Some may finish the course who should never be allowed to enter the ministry. Their disqualifications for the work are so obvious and so pronounced, that it is a positive crime both against themselves and against the Church, to lay the hands of ordination upon them. If such men become ministers they are foreordained to failure. They may get a charge but they will not be able to hold it any length of time, and as a rule they will leave it in worse condition than they found it. And this process will be repeated over and over again, as often as they make a change until death gives them release, or a long-suffering Church refuses any longer to be imposed upon. Then they must engage in some form of secular work, or become ecclesiastical tramps, or the objects of common charity. It is not the fault of their training, they were not capable of being trained. It is not entirely the fault of the men themselves; but rather their misfortune. Nature never intended them to be ministers, and God never called them to the work. To put them there is like putting square pegs into round holes, or round pegs into square holes. They may be forced in, but they will never fit, and they will never answer the same purpose that they would answer if they did fit. They will always rattle in their places,

or easily be dislodged or shifted, and will be little better than no pegs at all, often actually worse.

The seminary ought to be able after a three or four years' course of study, to discover whether a young man has in him the making of a minister or not, and it ought to be able to discover the fact to the young man himself, and it should not hesitate to do so. The young man should be willing also to accept this revelation, if prohibitory, with Christian grace and fortitude, and especially with overflowing gratitude, and to act accordingly.

Of course it will be said that the faculty of the theological seminary are not always competent to decide what a young man can do before he has been thoroughly tested, that sometimes a man from whom little or nothing has been expected, develops unexpected power and is eminently successful and useful. This is no doubt the case sometimes. But it does not often so happen. Indeed, such cases are so rare, as to be practically a negligible quantity. What the Church might suffer by an occasional loss of the services of such an exceptional man, would be gained many times over by being spared the infliction and burden of carrying incapable and unsuccessful men.

But there is a work also for the seminary to do, in this same line, for good and capable men. Nothing is more important for any man than to know himself, to know just what his gifts and capabilities are, or the kind of work he is best fitted to do. And no lesson, perhaps, is more difficult to learn. It is especially valuable to the minister because of the very nature, the difficulties, and the tremendous significance of his work, and the far-reaching results that may be involved if he should be mistaken in his estimate of himself. For the same reason it is for him especially difficult. But we know of no place, or circumstances, more favorable to his learning it than in the theological seminary and under the kind and considerate guidance of his professors there.

No doubt it would be a delicate task for these professors, and one fraught with responsibilities before which the best men might well tremble. But this is no reason why it should not be undertaken, and faithfully performed, in the fear of God, in

devotion to the Church, and with a due and fraternal regard to the best interests of the young men themselves.

In the second place, the seminary should help the students to find and understand their work. By this is not meant the special field of labor to which they shall go when they leave the seminary. This is not a matter of much importance. Some young men have a very exaggerated idea of the importance of "getting started right," as they sometimes express it. By this they mean getting for their first charge one that will give them some degree of prominence, and put them "in the line of promotion." They think that their future career depends largely on this, and have a mortal fear of beginning in a small or obscure place lest this may forever bar their progress and keep them from receiving their just deserts. There is no such thing. Water no more surely seeks and finds its own level than a man in the ministry ultimately comes to his own. It makes little difference where he begins, if he is fitted for great things they are sure to call to him in due time, and claim his presence and his services. Many of the most distinguished and successful preachers, in our own Church and in every other church, have begun their ministry in very obscure places, very far from the great centers of population and of influence. But somehow they have always been found out and their abilities and faithfulness duly recognized and rewarded. Just as often have we seen mediocre, or incompetent men, beginning in high places, and surely descending to their own proper level. A really great light throws its beams afar, even amid surrounding darkness, and those who want it are sure to find it, while a farthing rush-light cannot long palm itself off as a five hundred candle are lamp.

But we had in mind more especially the proper work of the minister, its nature, its importance, its demands, its responsibilities, its aims, and its joys and rewards. It is all-important that the minister, in entering on his work, should have a fairly clear knowledge and understanding of all these. He should realize that it is a great work to which he is giving himself, a far greater work than making money, or building ships, or founding cities, or ruling states or nations, or shaping policies, or any other of the great secular enterprises to which men are devoting

themselves with such self-sacrificing zeal, and untiring energy, in this materialistic age. He should realize that it is a difficult work, which will call for all his very best powers of body, and mind and heart, and probably still leave much to be desired in the way of adequate powers and suitable equipment to enable him worthily to meet its demands. He should realize that it is a responsible work, dealing, as it does, with the souls of men and shaping their spiritual characters and destinies both for time and for eternity.

" 'Tis not a call of small import
The pastor's care demands;
But what might fill an angel's heart,
And filled a Saviour's hands.

They watch for souls for which the Lord
Did heavenly bliss forego;
For souls which must forever live
In raptures or in woe."

(306)

The seminary should so present and so emphasize this work, as that the men who enter upon it might carry with them a due sense of responsibility, and an *esprit de corps* something like that which animates an army that is sent upon some important and desperate mission on which may depend not only their own lives, but the lives of thousands of their fellow-soldiers, and even the destinies of nations. No matter what hardships or perils such a mission might involve, no true soldier would ever think of drawing back, or hesitating on that account. Rather would he count these as adding to the attractiveness and the glory of the opportunity presented, and rejoice that he should be counted worthy to have a part in the undertaking.

Why should not ministers have such a spirit as this in entering on their great work, and like Paul not even count their lives dear unto themselves, if only they may finish their course with joy, and the ministry which they have received of the Lord Jesus, to testify the Gospel of the grace of God? (Acts 20:24).

The great danger of the seminary is that of professionalism, that the young men being trained there shall come to regard their

work as simply a way of earning a living, or making a name, just the same as the practice of medicine or of law, or a mercantile or business pursuit. If they go into it with this idea or feeling, they will bring profane fire to the altar, and God will surely disown them and their work, even if He does not cast them out and destroy them. It is for the seminary to save them from this by ever keeping before them the real character of their work as the ministry of reconciliation, in which they are made stewards of the mysteries of God, and are to be co-workers with God Himself.

In the third place the seminary should help the young men to find and learn to use the tools of their profession, or calling.

Pre-eminent among these is the Word of God itself, our common English Bible. Every minister should know this and know it thoroughly, even if he knows no other book, for it must be his chief source of material for his sermons, his best cyclopedia of illustrations, and his most effective weapon both offensive and defensive in carrying on his warfare against sin and evil, and for righteousness and salvation. The writer recently listened to a number of discourses from a lay evangelist, who knows but little of history or science, or of general literature, or even of grammar or rhetoric. But he does know his Bible as few ministers know it, and never before was I more impressed with the truth of the statement made in Hebrews 4:12, that "the Word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and interests of the heart."

It may be all right to study Hebrew and Greek, and to learn to read the Bible in the original, if there is time for this. But a minister must know the English Bible and be able to use it easily and skillfully or be shorn of one of the chief elements of power both in the pulpit, and in the private "cure of souls" in his pastoral work. The seminaries should insist on this whatever else must be omitted or sacrificed to accomplish it.

Commentaries are an important part of the minister's equipment, and he should be taught how to select them and use them so as to get the best, and use them to the best advantage. This is especially important just now because so many of the newer

commentaries are infected with a very dangerous and destructive form of "Higher Criticism," and are even prepared and published as a propaganda of this school.

Of course theology must still be, as it ever has been, and ever should be, the very back-bone of the course of study in the seminary. Sometimes we hear a cry raised against the preaching of theology, but whether it is preached or not in the pulpit, theology must always be the substratum underlying, the skeleton, giving form and consistency and positive force to all true and safe and effective preaching. The minister is often tempted, in these days, to turn aside from the study of theology to the study of economics and sociology and the social questions of the day, and to preaching on these and kindred topics, with the idea that they are more interesting and more practical. But to yield to this temptation to any considerable extent will surely be fatal to the minister's highest usefulness.

We are glad to quote here a few sentences from an article on *The Call to Theology*, written by Professor Francis G. Peabody, and published in the first number of the *Harvard Theological Review*, (January, 1908):

"The danger of heeding the call to a 'practical ministry' to the neglect of theological study and doctrinal preaching is real and vital * * * It is suicidal to anticipate a revival of religion which shall be disassociated from a revival of theology... * * * The only permanent cure for wrong thinking is right thinking. The only way out of a bad theology is through good theology. Either the theologians must lead the Church, or the Church must cease to lead the world."

To some persons this may be a rather unexpected testimony from this source, but it is all the more impressive on that account. And it is eminently true.

Church history, and symbolics, and homiletics, &c., all have their place and value and are not likely to be neglected. But we need not stop to discuss each of them separately. We wish, however, briefly to emphasize two other things that are not so likely to receive due attention.

One of these is the use of general literature. Students usually have a more or less thorough course in English Literature in the college. But they need some further and more specific

instruction in the reading and use, and even in the buying of books of general literature, with a view to the help to be gotten from them in the work of preaching.

I shall never forget the great pleasure and help, the light and inspiration, received from the reading of the lectures of Professor Austin Phelps on *Men and Books*, first published in 1882. I felt then, and still feel, that every theological course should embrace a similar course of lectures, or something equivalent to them. It was the writer's privilege, when teaching in the Western Theological Seminary, to take a number of classes through Professor Phelps' *Men and Books*, using the lectures not so much as a text-book to be committed and recited, but rather as a basis for a familiar discussion of the several topics presented, and the students were almost always enthusiastic in their testimony as to the pleasure and the profit of the course.

Dr. C. E. Jefferson has a paragraph in his little book, *The Minister as Prophet*, bearing on the same subject, which is worth quoting. After speaking of the importance of the study of the Bible, he continues: "But the Bible is not the only book. God has revealed himself through other men than the Jews. English literature contains a revelation. You ought to read poetry for vision and music and color, biography for stimulus and courage and patience, history for perspective and proportion, science for revelation as wonderful in its way as the revelation which came through Moses and the prophets of Israel, fiction for analysis of character and the widening of experience.

* * * Shut yourselves up with the great books. Do not spend too much time on magazines and papers. Read the great poets and the great biographies and the great histories and the great novels, and strive to know something of the great sciences of astronomy and biology. You are to read these not to parade your learning before your congregation, but because great books make mental blood and muscle and bone."

This is splendid advice, and perhaps most ministers come to appreciate its value sooner or later. But for the most part they are left to stumble upon it by their own experience, instead of being taught it in the seminary as they should be. Many never discover it, or at least never learn how to profit by it, simply because they were not started right in the beginning.

The other thing which needs greater emphasis in the work of making ministers is better training in good composition and in effective delivery.

It may be said that this is the work of the colleges, and in a general way it is. But in addition to what may be gotten during the college course, usually all too little, students for the ministry should have additional, and most careful and thorough discipline in the writing and delivery of sermons, which is to be their chief work in life.

For, say what we may about the value of pastoral work, and the importance of administrative skill and genius, the chief business of the preacher is to preach, and unless he can do this acceptably and efficiently he can never be greatly successful in his calling. No man can preach well who does not know how to write and how to speak, and both of these kingly arts should be taught in our seminaries much more thoroughly than they are, and should be given superlative emphasis.

A paragraph or two more from Dr. Jefferson's *The Minister as a Prophet* may serve as a fitting close to this discussion.

"It is surprising how stoutly and stubbornly the Churches insist upon preachers knowing how to preach. They will forgive almost everything else, but they will not forgive inability to preach. They have a wholesome reverence for learning, but they would rather have a man with no diploma who can preach than a man with two diplomas who cannot preach. They believe in experience, and acknowledge its value; but they would rather have a man with no experience who can preach than a man with years of experience who has lost [or never had] the gift of presenting truth in ways which lift and strengthen. In all this the Churches may be stiff-necked and unreasonable, but it is a frame of mind which is not likely to be changed. And if I were the president of a theological seminary, I should listen to what the spirit is saying through the Churches, and should set my house in order for the training of preachers. * * * That men should Sunday after Sunday stand in Christian pulpits, ignorant of the fundamental rules of thinking, and utterly incompetent to use the English language with either grace or power, is a scandal of such huge dimensions that every seminary in the land ought to consecrate itself afresh to the great task of putting

an end to the scandal, and training up a race of preachers who shall be able to clothe in fitting form the heavenly message intrusted to their lips."

II.

BY PROFESSOR M. COOVER, D.D.

The making of a minister of the Gospel must deal with at least three factors, the material, the means, and the product; the man, the making, and the ministry, or service.

In one sense what is true of the poet is true also of the preacher, he is born, not made. With respect to the making, however, capable educational agencies can make of a non-born candidate a very efficient counterfeit, who may do very creditable service by current face value. If the candidate be a man born to the art, he nevertheless requires the fullest education. He has capacities, but not full-grown powers. The graving tool must fashion his angularities into potencies, not remove his idiocyncracies, but form them into attractions. A man's peculiarity properly cultivated becomes his positive polarity.

And the ministry of our day is not the required ministry of one hundred, or even fifty, years ago. The age of speculative pursuits passes into applied science; the Christian evangelic proclamation passes into applied Christianity. The Gospel of apostolic times is the Gospel for to-day, but it goes out to meet a changed order of society. There are educational, industrial, social, and civic problems now which were unknown to primitive preachers. Sociology, Political Science and Economy, must make for righteousness, and should be made to go by the way of the cross, by Christian sacrifice, love, and fellowship. The brotherhood of man must be connected by the Elder Brother with the Fatherhood of God.

The preacher should be the leader in the amelioration of the evil conditions of men. He should direct civic forces, guide motives, connect the Gospel with all human operations. He must know his topics to preach. To preach well he must understand sin as well as grace, understand industrial and civic conditions as well as Christian remedies for recovery. Christianity

is designed to save the man, and not simply his soul, to make endurable and profitable the life that now is as well as to nourish hope and faith in the life to come.

1. *The Man.* A man must be a specialist to-day to be potent in his sphere of service. The staunch steel construction car for transportation of coal and ore cannot take the place of the Pullman coach for comfortable travel. The cart horse should not fly, nor the honey bee draw a Conestoga to fulfil its function. A good man must be good for something, but he cannot be equally good for everything. What is he good for, good for a preacher?

Education does not consist simply in the acquisition of facts and acquaintance with forces, but chiefly training in method for the use of power. And method, for value, depends upon the nature of the agent, the properties of the man, the capabilities of adjustment to what is to be done.

The good, pious, promising country boy with but meagre literary antecedents may make an efficient preacher, but he has a longer way to go to reach his efficiency. He must make up what his forefathers did not do of mental action and application. And in most cases the curriculum of education ends and the young man is graduated still somewhat crude. There is something in heredity, something in the antecedents of an efficient preacher. The city or town boy of feeble ancestral exhibition of intellectual power and moral leadership gives no better results.

Education is now so widely dispersed that the laity have become a very intelligent and keenly discerning class. The merely good and pious preacher fails to be a leader if he is not abreast with the world's learning, and capable of keeping abreast. Candidates for the ministry have required of them qualifications of a high order.

It is worth considering on the part of benevolent boards of education for assistance to the office of the ministry whether it is wise to select candidates until they have been graduated from college. The ministry is on trial to-day, and will undergo closer scrutiny to-morrow. It must possess intrinsic commanding power, or else decline in influence. Its greatness does not consist in being associated merely with a great theme and a

great religious economy. The man as exponent is a conspicuous factor.

The true ministry is not an order, but an efficient spiritual service, and the good man should be powerfully good for something. The early environment, and the antecedents of young men, tell potently for fitness or unfitness in the Christian ministry. Power of intellectual grasp and efficiency of method cannot supplant sincere piety and the embodiment of the moral and religious qualities of Christianity; but the intellectual vigor of our age will not be satisfied with moral essays or religious platitudes from the pulpit, however strenuous the preacher may be in personal piety and purity. Men want something to think about. Christianity with its breadth and depth of theme and import can furnish intellectual stimulus for moral resolution and motive, and the vigorous soul is not content without it. The minister who cannot measure up to his theme with considerable comprehensiveness and intellectual force cannot satisfy the hunger of a scientific age, or give religion the setting it demands and is capable of in the world's present economy.

2. *The Means.* Society and its education have moved forward; has the Theological Seminary in its equipments and chairs of instruction been equally advanced? Nothing can take the place of the old established chairs of Systematic Theology, Ecclesiastical History, Interpretation of the Divine Word, Homiletics, and studies in the original languages of the Scriptures. But a wider perspective of fitness for ministerial service demands additional facilities in the seminary to meet the broader training necessary for an adequate ministry.

Religious facts and forces have been persistently and efficiently taught, wisely systematized and drilled in unto fulness of theory. But training in method has been neglected, or rather the need for efficient method has become prominent through the necessity of meeting the new economical, industrial, and civic conditions of society. Departments for instruction in application have become necessary. Applied Christianity to the diversified social and economic features requires teachers well equipped. If the preacher should be a specialist, how much more the professor.

The older chairs in our Theological Seminaries oft have in-

congruous subjects constituting the work of the department. No teacher can be adequately qualified to teach many subjects most of which are incognate branches. Our theological chairs need readjustment; and our seminaries need new chairs with adequate equipment and facilities.

Biblical theology is in a measure supplanting dogmatics, and the comparative science of religion has become almost as prominent as ecclesiastical history. A hazy comprehension of philosophy and a meagre knowledge of the now much cultivated science of ethics incapacitate for a clear differentiation of ancient religions with their ethical and religious codes from the profounder development of the science of Christian ethics, and the origin of the revelatory religious factors of the Christian religion. The student who is unable through lack of linguistic training to sip the delicate flavor of thought in its original setting cannot distinguish well between Pagan and Christian thought and ethics, nor weigh adequately the virtues of compared religions. And the same lack incapacitates the student to grasp the full meaning of the creeds and confessions whose history and evolution are symbolized in a strange tongue.

The call to the ministry to-day is followed immediately by the call to theology. The methods of evangelism to the unawakened in Christendom have about run their course, and must be followed by profounder presentations of religious truths for permanent edification and development in spiritual force and character.

A danger lies in departments of applied Christianity in placing over stress upon training in method, forgetful of the fundamental thing to be methodized. Profound acquaintance with efficient method cannot be forceful with superficial acquaintance with the theological truths to be conveyed. We cannot turn thought to the Word of God without formulating some kind of theology. It is the expression of the relation of God to man. And one must know and experience the thing in its properties before he can wisely devise the best method of its promulgation and conveyance. Both power and method must be equally studied, and the logical order must not be overlooked. The theory and its application must be equally well considered; the di-

vine truth and power seized, then the conveyance and application exercised.

3. *The Ministry.* The greatness of Christian service is becoming more widely recognized. The socialist who rejects Christianity, in his rejection expresses what he thinks Christianity ought to do. "How to go to Heaven" is only one chapter in the volume of true religion; how to live each day by means of religious forces given for to-day consumes most thought and energy. Christianity should be the acknowledged and applied panacea for human ills of both circumstance and character, for ill-environment and evil personal will. The difficulties in the relations between capital and labor, the adjustments of industrial and social inequalities, must be fixed by the golden rule of the Lawgiver of the universe.

Divine immanence is a great truth. The divine presence should not merely come into contact with the world, its forces and animated beings, but fully permeate all earthly principles and institutions. For things to become glorious it must be Christ in men the hope of glory. The consummation of all the good divinely to be wished can come only in the avenues along which the fullest divine energy flows. The road to that one far off divine event should be a clear path to the Seer of God. The network of side intricacies may be left for each day's unravelling, but the greatness of the end, and the divineness of the means must never escape the preacher's vision. Its greatness gives attraction and stimulus. Its inner meaning is the solution of the riddle of the universe. To see is to assimilate, and to do is to know. To see Him as He is, is to be transformed by beholding, for in being phenomenally visible He is dynamically communicable. To see with eyes of spiritual discernment is to open the soul to His incoming. This vision should animate the institution that makes, and inspire the man efficiently made; its substance empower the minister and his making.

III.

BY PROFESSOR F. P. MANHART, D.D.

This brief article will consider, mainly, "the making of a minister," as far as entrance into college.

The first factor in the making of a minister is the home. This is a divine institute. Its human basis is affection or love. Of every child, the parent should be able to say with Hannah: "For this child I prayed." It is the child's right to be thus born, and not to be born as an accident of lust.

The supreme right of God to the child, should be already in the mind of the parents when it is baptized, since, among other most precious truths, baptism means that all human life is from God, unto God, and for God, in a higher sense that it is from, to and for human parents.

The whole tone and tenor of a Christian home should be such as to create and foster in the developing child, the conviction that to serve God, in the home, in life's honest and honorable avocations, and, if called, in some special office of ministry in his Church, is the very acme of man's duties and of a man's privileges. By thus serving, in home, community and Church, he becomes God's building, God's tilled land and God's fellow worker. 1 Cor. 3:9.

In every professedly Christian home, the Word of God should be read and revered. Its teachings should be the first in all religious and moral, and as far as possible, in all other factors of life. (Note the oft repeated statements of Dr. G. Stanley Hall, that the Bible is the chief text book of the up-to-date psychologist.) In the home it should ever hold its rightful place, as the one supreme "book of power"

The Christian home should be loyal in its attendance upon and support of the Church, which is another divine institution. It should regard the minister of the Church as God's servant and ambassador, and its spiritual shepherd. His office is holy. Ministers of the Church, and the work and institutions of the Church should not be the subjects of thoughtless pity or selfish criticisms. They should be considered fairly, honorably, and in view of universal human imperfections, charitably, as agencies of God for the doing of great work for Him and for men in the world.

The Christian home must regard it as its most serious, yet most blessed, duty and privilege to train its children for useful, honorable and Christlike service of God and man in the Church.

The Christian home must place the highest value upon an education in the home, in the Church, and in the schools of

lower and higher grades. It is the glory of Scotland that the paths from its homes to its universities are never overgrown with grass. As yet, in America, we Lutherans have far too few paths between our homes and our church schools.

It is, therefore, imperative that our Christian homes should also adopt and foster more just and adequate ideas concerning Christian education. Such ideas mean that in every intellectual element, Christian education in the home, the Church and in the Church's higher schools must not be one which below the best standards maintained in secular education, while acquirements and culture must be completely dominated and permeated, and therefore greatly elevated, by the highest of all truths, which are those of our holy Christian faith. It is humiliating and unjust to all concerned when Christian people do their educational work in their homes, churches and schools in a way that justifies the statement, that the children of this world are wiser in their generation than the children of light. Does not that severe condemnation of our Lord, yet, measurably rest upon our Lutherans in America.

Concerning the ministry, these are the Church's absolute needs for her well-being and progress to-day: 1. More men for the ministry. 2. Men of a higher grade religiously. 3. Men of a higher grade mentally.

Among the Missouri Lutherans the parochial school in addition to pastor and home, does a great work in preparing men for the higher special schools of the Church. In the General Synod we must rely mainly upon the home and the pastor, with some incidental help from the Sunday School.

These needs are not nearly so well understood and provided for, by home, pastor, congregation and synod, as they should be. Too much is expected of the Church College and Seminary. If the students upon entering college lack in religious and mental strength, they will graduate without the full culture that a college course well taken imparts. When such college graduates enter the seminary they are not able to take its course with full profit. Thus the Church gets ministers too weak in the real vital power of Christianity and too weak mentally to do the full work of Christian ministers.

Such men are sometimes quite popular with congregations,

but it is the kind of popularity that is a credit neither to the congregation nor to minister. Both are ignobly content with the lower, instead of striving for the higher. With the "divine unrest" over conditions that should be bettered that all noble people have, or can be made to have, and under the leadership of godly and stalwart pastors, both together can and will attain higher intellectual attainments, greater power to build up the Church and to bless men, and a richer personal enjoyment of Christian culture and fellowship. Where prophet and people are weak enough to be satisfied on the plain where they might scale the mountain, there must always be the limited vision, undeveloped power, lower grades of service, less influence, and limited spiritual fellowship and joys.

The vastly increased complexity of life makes higher and more varied demands upon the pastor of a modern Church. Ministers, as such, are treated with diminished deference. Higher education is more general. The Gospel, as meaning salvation from sin, has little power in some influential circles. These things afford a sufficient basis for a plea for stronger men physically, mentally and religiously, without inquiry whether there has been a relative decline in the effective power of the ministry due to actually lessened power among the ministers themselves.

Our homes of highest social and intellectual standing devote too few of their sons to the ministry. In addition to those who come from poorer homes and are properly helped by special funds, there should be a far larger number from homes of plenty, and especially from homes of general and Christian culture. More students should come from the homes of ministers, physicians, lawyers, teachers and other educated people.

As to preparation for entrance to college, a single statement is sufficient, viz, it should absolutely be complete both as to the quantity and quality of the work required by a good standard of admission. One of the most important periods in the educational process is that of the preparatory or secondary school. With the rapid, but by no means uniform, development of the high school, the great increase in the number of courses given by the colleges and the different subjects that may be offered for admission, the situation has become much more complex and trying for the

Church college, upon which the seminary must largely depend for students.

The standard of admission to the denominational college should be reasonable, yet high enough that such students only may enter as can profitably do college work. Colleges should never be expected to do the work in any study, of preparatory schools. The preparatory school should do its own work, and do it right. No one should be allowed to pass through it with a lot of weakness in language, methods of study and understanding of the studies pursued. Colleges and seminaries rarely ever entirely correct such defects, nor can they reasonably be expected to do so.

The Lutheran Church of America naturally has special difficulties just here. Most of our people came to America using the German and Scandinavian languages. Thousands of our ministers today came from homes where language was in a transitional state. Necessarily, many young men from such homes will use *English with less accuracy in pronunciation, idiom and construction than others whose ancestors have used English for generations. These linguistic limitations account for the rise and development of some intellectual idiosyncrasies peculiar to some so-called "Dutchmen."*

Where the defects indicated exist, they should be recognized and, if possible, removed, since the Lutheran ministry and Church in America will never exert their full power upon the life and thought of the country except by a correct and masterful use of the English language. The work thus required must be done mainly during those earlier years of adolescence usually covered by the preparatory school.

There is no greater need in education among American Lutherans to-day than that of first-class preparatory schools, which shall do thoroughly well the work that preparatory schools should do. (1)

Let it be repeated with emphasis, the need of the hour is more men of the best types for the ministry. The Church needs young men for her colleges and seminaries who are strong in

(1) Princeton College, at its recent midyear examination, dropped 73 men. Possibly, an adherence to standards like Princeton's, would bring at least equally dire results, in our denominational colleges.

body, who are strong in mind, and who are strong in Christian character. With such there will be no questions of discipline for wrong conduct, no failure to understand and master all of the improving and cultural work of the courses, and little or no censure upon the schools for sending out men who are poorly fitted to meet the manifold, exacting, and surpassingly important duties of the Christian ministry of to-day.

ARTICLE IX.

MODERN THEOLOGY.

BY REV. AUGUSTUS SPIECKERMANN.

The German theologian, J. S. Semler, who lived about the middle of the eighteenth century, is a representative of rationalism in its first stage. He it was who first applied to the Holy Scriptures a rationalistic exegesis with its natural explanation of miracles. Many things that until that time had not been touched by the knife of criticism, disappeared now. For everything that could not be justified before the course of reason was thrown aside.

Thus Semler became the father of modern Biblical criticism. His disciples went still further, and we therefore need not wonder at all that they were fiercely attacked. For their opponents have accused them of having undermined the good old faith by introducing the same methods of investigation that were in vogue in the different departments of science. Thus the Holy Scriptures had been divested of their divine character. That this is a fact, cannot be denied. But in justice to criticism we have right here to remember one thing, namely, that criticism itself is not a result, but a process. It is consequently not identical with the conclusions of any school. Indeed, the modern scientific study of nature and the Bible has nothing godless in its aim or method, yet it may lead a person to an irreligious conception of the world, if he allows himself to be influenced by materialism or any kindred view of the world. That modern criticism is, to a large degree, under influence of materialism, must be explained by the wonderful progress of natural science. When the latter through its inductive method had achieved the greatest success; when with its evolutionary theory under Darwin in England and Haeckel in Germany, it celebrated its greatest triumphs, and in its proud arrogance denounced, yes, even branded those as unscientific who did not submit to the results of its investigations, then modern theologians thought it necessary to meet their opponents on the same

ground by applying the same methods in the department of theological thought. Their efforts deserve high praise. Of course, it cannot be denied that many of them became a prey to materialism, and that some of the greatest Biblical critics developed even into avowed sceptics. Especially the younger theologians and university students seemed to be charmed by the new theories that often were explained in splendid style by masters of eloquence. The air of superiority these men assumed; their denunciations of older theories which they often made a subject of ridicule; the great display of learning with which they spread the new knowledge, this all captivated the minds of inexperienced youths and made them look down upon the views that they had cherished until that time. Thus it happened that they considered their old religious ideas as being based on scientific misconceptions. These ideas had to be done away with, and that as soon as possible. Science had taught them greater things. It had, for instance, taught them that creation was not, according to the old idea, immediate and particular, but that all forms of life had developed out of lower forms. It had also taught them that the relation of God to the world had not to be explained by a series of providences, as the old theology had it, but by an energy that neither increases nor diminishes, and that in the universe there was an absolute reign of law. And these theories that diminished God and higher powers suited them, because they were in full harmony with the mechanical view of the world. But even if this view wears a scientific mantle, it is not up to date, for materialism has a very limited view of the world. It does not know what to do with the phenomena of mind which it denies. It must declare itself a bankrupt when it is confronted with things as telepathy, clairvoyance, spiritualistic phenomena, and the miraculous power of mind over matter at a distance. In the face of such phenomena even such a careful philosopher as Sir Oliver Lodge admits that psychical research may confirm old truths of the Bible and open a new era for religion. This is a broadminded view and puts no limit to the future expansion and development of human nature. Not so rationalism and materialism. While rationalism acknowledges reason as the sole arbiter and discards everything it cannot comprehend, materialism insists on being the only theory which

explains everything in a natural manner and has no recourse to any arbitrary factor, any transcendent cause or supernatural will. One can understand that theologians who are under the influence of such doctrines may come to dangerous conclusions. When you want to inform yourself about their doings watch them when they apply their famous method of interpretation; see how they eliminate or change everything that does not suit them and how finally, when they have torn to pieces the wonderful dome of Scripture, there is nothing left that will serve suffering and helpless humanity in its aspiration after a higher and better life.

An anonymous writer in the New York *Independent* in an article entitled: *Confessions of an Undistinguished Heretic*, furnishes sufficient proof in that line. According to him there are two prime sources of information as to the words and deeds of Jesus, namely, the Gospel of Mark, and the collection of speeches preserved in Matthew and Luke. The two latter ones have copied from Mark and their additional material has to be examined carefully, for it does not always mean reliable added information, but only embellishment. One has—so the writer continues—to consider that the evangelic record is a thing of growth and that accretion and well intended imagination accounts for the expansion of gospel history. For this reason—he means—the simpler narrative is always to be preferred. To give the reader a clear conception of how the expansion of the gospel history has taken place, he calls attention: (1) To Jesus' baptism, and says that in Mark the records make the rending of the heavens and the descent of the dove a vision in the soul of Jesus, while in Matthew and Luke this vision is transformed into an outward event. (2) That Matthew and Luke make out of the solitary struggle of Jesus in the wilderness, as Mark relates it, a legendary dialogue with Satan. By that the preaching of Jonah, as Luke has preserved it in its original form, has become in the hands of Matthew a prophecy of the resurrection.—In these examples you see the arbitrary tendency of an apostle of modern theology to brush away everything that does not suit his narrow method of investigation. The supernatural must die. This is his watchword. Therefore his anxiety to construct the history of Bible times by sifting traditions and discarding

so-called pious additions in the most arbitrary manner. The untenableness of such a procedure on the basis of the gospels, however, will be admitted by any impartial student of history. It will also be admitted that the assertion of some of the modern school that they know after thousands of years what is genuine and what is not, is simply ridiculous, because all gospels agree in the essentials of Christianity. Their little variations in unimportant details confirm rather than weaken their statements. Modern theologians know that, but not a few of their school are driven by the love of notoriety. To find an ingenious hypothesis for the solution of this or that theological problem and to become thus a star in the sky of science, is the ambition of many. But, alas, a hypothesis is a thing without a foundation, and when the author sees it applauded to-day, he might see it ridiculed to-morrow. And on such shifting sands modern theology wants us to build our Christian life? It may wait pretty long before we are ready for that. And when, in the meantime, it will persuade us to come into the realms of its fancy, we will enter an energetic protest. Yes, we will protest with our whole soul against the destructive work of modern theology. We do not believe that it can give us a better gospel than that written by Matthew, Mark, Luke and John. We do not believe that a theology influenced by rationalism and materialism is able to satisfy the secret cravings of the soul, for it does not bring peace and joy to the hearts of men. It may meet, for a while, the literary tastes of some, but it cannot influence the great multitude. This can only be done by the good old gospel. Here is Holy Land, and we breathe in it the air of truth.

But modern theology does not show too much reverence for this truth. There are too many things in the gospels it hates. There is, for instance, that hateful miraculous element and the so-called legendary mantle that is thrown over the story of Christ and other things. It thinks their removal is necessary for the benefit of those who like them stand in the light of natural science, and like them love to do away with everything that seems not to be in harmony with the results of modern investigations. He who tries to contradict those results, is branded as an unscientific man. And yet, when a man who thinks for himself, examines the propositions of modern theology, he

will admit that though he has received from it a good many literary benefits, yet is at a loss to the satisfaction of his spiritual desires. For modern theology has no harmonious system, that by its truth appeals to men. One notices, on the contrary, that though it claims to be built on a scientific foundation, it represents an alarming confusion of opinions. This can be seen especially in matters concerning the value of the different evangelists. While some prefer Mark as the most genuine one, one will find others just as strongly in favor of one of the other evangelists. Their different standpoint is to be explained by the different hypothesis from which they proceed in their investigations. When a person believes in the miraculous element he will favor those books of the Bible that furnish him most material; when he loves moral and intellectual thought, the selection of books will be accordingly; when he is under the spell of rationalism or materialism, he will prefer those books that emphasize more the natural and human side of the Christian religion. Many of the modern school have decided in favor of Mark, because this evangelist, stating every thing in a brief way, gives them ample opportunity of striking a good many things that are in their road. And when you now see what all is arbitrarily dismissed by the modern school, then you ask yourself more than once, if such a procedure is in harmony with the rules of fairness and propriety. In all truth, the modern theologian's attitude toward sacred history is overbearing. His explanations and interpretations violent. The miraculous conception of Christ is superficially denied because according to their system Jesus is a man like others and born like others. In this point the anonymous writer in the *Independent* agrees with Gustaf Frenssen, who, in his sensational novel *Hilligenlei*, calls the Master the greatest of all heroes that have been produced in any nation. But these artists of modern interpretation perform still greater wonders. In order to prove Christ's human descent they take recourse to wonderful fancies. They say that an overheated imagination has made His admirers exaggerate His human qualities and that thus the virgin birth has become but the form in which a legend-loving age confessed its faith in the divine worth of the Nazarene. That sounds learned, but is not

so, especially when we consider what artificial methods have to be used to reach such a result.

Modern theology shows here again that it lacks the faculty of appreciating the creative activity of the Holy Ghost. Believing in no higher power, and believing that the natural power of the human heart needs only to be developed to enable man to lead a moral life, it never experiences (something about) the uplifting and transforming power of the Holy Spirit. If modern theology would have experiences in that line, if, for instance, it would know that through this spiritual power notorious drunkards who had been given up by those who knew them best, are changed; if it would know that by the same power violators of the sixth commandment are transformed into decent men, and become useful members of human society, then it would not be so hard for them to conclude that a power which can work such spiritual wonders must also be able to work others and that the historical testimony of the old Church: "Born of the Holy Ghost," is not out of order. Then we would also hear no longer the worn-out phrase that Christ was Joseph's son. Christ's sonship to Joseph was, as every impartial student of sacred history knows, a reputed and not a real one. This is suggested by Luke's words: "As was supposed." (Luke III, 23.) The anonymous writer's reference to the genealogy in Matthew as designating Joseph as Jesus' Father is entirely unfounded. Matthew counts up the different forefathers, until Joseph, for he who writes for Jews has to give Christ's legal descent. Joseph he declares to be the husband of Mary of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ. In order to remove any doubt as to the miraculous birth of Christ, he tells his supernatural birth in such a way that no impartial student of history will misunderstand its meaning. Of course, our anonymous writer will say, did I not tell you that the gospels are literary complications with a history to be traced and that from this point of view you have to look upon my results." Why, yes, dear friend, we know, but we are nevertheless unable to use your arbitrary method of interpretation, as it appears to us more miraculous than the good old one. We know that with your explaining-away method you find no difficulty in discarding such things as the resurrection of Christ that has been so truthfully

recorded. But wait, psychical research is at work. Wonderful phenomena whose existence has been denied, have now commanded the attention of such scientists as Wallace, Loellner, F. W. H. Meyers, T. J. Hudson and others. Their scientific investigation will prove the truth of the Bible and show the correctness of old Shakespeare's word: "There are more things in heaven and earth than are dreamt of in your philosophy!" In fact, ruling schools of science were often blind to phenomena in the pioneering and unorthodox departments of science. They stubbornly refused to investigate them, because they could not form a conception of them according to known laws. But from the inability to form a clear conception of a thing does not follow its impossibility. This was clearly shown when wireless telegraphy came up. Even scientists of the first rank denied then its possibility on the basis of their prejudiced theories. But they received the same lesson as those scientists who years ago denied the possibility of the penetration of dark bodies through light—and the X rays like a grinning spectre sneered at their limited wisdom. All these things suggest caution and make it our duty to study carefully the different hypotheses that are presented to us for consideration. Hypotheses are nothing new to the Church. From the earliest times heretics tried to introduce them into her teachings. She, however, knew how to protect herself against them by acknowledging only that which is founded on Holy Writ. Thus she developed a system of truth that had the consent of all within her bounds. And when in modern times theologians should find out that through the influence of rationalistic or materialistic theories their religious ideas have suffered a change, that is not in harmony with the teachings of their Church, then they ought to have so much courage as to quit the service of their Church. For a Church that does not practice what it teaches deserves the ridicule of the world. Dr. Crassey knew that and when he left he acted like a gentleman. Others who are in the same condition, should follow his example and not wait for the consilium abundi. There are many fields of usefulness where with a good conscience they can make their living. Their stay in the Church will prove dangerous. This is evidenced by missionaries in foreign fields. The cry for help against modern criticism in India

should induce these men to leave a Church that through the centuries has been maintained by the same good old faith, that Church that has received the promise of a perfect victory over all obstacles.

ARTICLE X.

THE IMPECCABILITY OF CHRIST.

BY PROFESSOR J. A. SINGMASTER, D.D.

Jesus Christ was a perfect man. There is no flaw in his life or character. Was there, however, a possibility of sin in him? Could he have fallen? Was he peccable or impeccable? Was he able not to sin (*posse non peccare*) or was he unable to sin (*non posse peccare*)? These questions may appear to some as purely speculative, to be relegated to the Age of Scholasticism, and as unedifying and unworthy of serious consideration. But to us they seem to be vital, affecting not only the perfection of Christ's person, but also the confidence in which we rest our hopes upon him. For surely we want an absolutely immutable foundation for our faith. We are the more concerned for a right answer, because of a very common misconception, based upon a wrong idea of temptation, and held not only by the popular mind but taught by some wise and good men. We can tolerate nothing that impairs the absolute perfection of him, who was the effulgence of the glory of God and the very image of his substance. It shall be our purpose within the limits of a brief article to establish the proof of the impeccability of our Lord.

Our argument consists in two strong presumptive proofs, and a third categorical proof which can not be successfully disputed. These will be followed by a consideration of the objections which have been made.

1. The Impeccability of Christ is a Corollary from His Sinless Perfection.

a. Let us notice Christ's sinlessness or better his sinless perfection.

It is true that since the time of Celsus there have not been wanting those, who have sought to discredit Christ by affirming, not only a taint in his birth: but also serious ethical deficiencies in his life and teachings. But the number of these is so small and their bias so apparent and, in some cases, their personal character so wicked, that it will not be necessary in this connec-

tion to take any serious account of them. Over against these we may place the common verdict of mankind that Christ stands quite apart from the rest of men. Napoleon said of him, "Everything in him astonishes me. His spirit overawes one, and his will confounds me. Between him and whoever else in the world there is no possible term of comparison. He is truly a being by himself."

When we examine the authentic records of Christ's life, we shall find a confirmation and an explanation of the verdict of history. His personal claims to sinlessness are undoubted. He boldly challenged his enemies to convict him of sin, John 8:46. They could not, in spite of all their hostility and the effort of the detectives which were ever on his track to catch him in his words or in some violation of moral or civil law. Even his final condemnation could be secured only by suborning witnesses. These claims of our Lord were not made in a boastful way but in the spirit of that meekness which ever characterized him and which makes him so attractive to men to this very day.

There was also in Christ an utter absence of any saying or act which would in the least implicate him in sin. He never confesses any personal sin, though he recognized it and denounced it in others. Moreover he taught his disciples to pray for deliverance from its guilt and power. The Lord's Prayer contains these petitions to this effect. Yet Jesus himself never prays for forgiveness, though he led a life of prayer, examples of which are recorded. This is all the more remarkable in view of the fact that the prophets and the apostles all confess their sinfulness and pray for pardon.

There is no evidence that Christ ever even cherished a sinful or ignoble thought. He was "holy, guileless, undefiled, separated from sinners," Heb. 7:26. Judged by the most exalted ethical standard known among men his character is unimpeachable.

The verdict of his most intimate friends establishes our contention. In their personal intercourse with him they discovered that "he did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth," 1 Pet. 2:22. John the Baptist realized his unworthiness to baptize him. Peter felt that he was a sinful man when brought into contact with Christ's divine holiness. The disciple, whom

Jesus loved, wrote, "He was manifested to take away sins; and in him is no sin," 1 John 3:5. Paul declares "him who knew no sin he made to be sin on our behalf," 2 Cor. 5:21.

The tributes of those who were not his particular friends and in some cases even inimical to him are equally explicit. Judas acknowledged that he had betrayed innocent blood. Pilate found no fault in him. His wife called him a just man. The centurion who guarded the cross said "Certainly this was a righteous man."

b His sinless perfection amid the temptations of his life form a strong presumption of his impeccability.

He lived in a sinful environment. He faced not only such temptations as are common to man, but also such as arise from the possession of extraordinary gifts. He was the special target of Satan, whose power he had come to destroy. The Prince of light and the Prince of this world waged a decisive struggle. We can not doubt that the latter employed every art and device in the repertory of evil to overthrow our Lord, but all in vain. No power seen or unseen, human or Satanic, caused him to swerve from righteousness. We conclude that Christ was invincible. If the greatest of adversaries could not cause him to fall who or what could?

2. The Impeccability of Christ may be deduced from his unbroken fellowship with the Father.

Jesus lived in constant communion with God. When he was a lad he had a vivid consciousness of the presence of his Father. He felt that he must be about his Father's business. Moreover, God gave him the Spirit without measure, John 3:34. He had at his command all the resources of grace. His nearness to God was no delusion. He realized that God saw him and heard him. He spoke familiarly with God.

Is it conceivable that it was at all possible for sin to come between Christ and the Father? We do know from Christian experience that a man's freedom from falling into sin is in direct proportion to his fellowship with God. Could that fellowship be maintained perfectly without interruption by a man without sin he never could become sinful. Whatever might be the metaphysical or theoretical possibilities in the case such a person would be actually impeccable. These conditions are absolutely

present in Christ. His fellowship with the Father is indissoluble, and hence he is *impeccable*.

3. The Impeccability of Christ is absolutely assured by His Divine Nature.

Let us remember who Christ is. He is the theanthropic Personality, the God-man, having a divine and a human nature. He is the Son of God, the Word, who became man. He was a person from eternity, before he took a human nature. He never ceased being God. We may not limit the infinite in his expression and manifestation of himself. It is of this divine-human Being that we predicate *impeccability*.

Christ in becoming the second Adam assumed the nature that the first Adam had before the Fall. He did not take a sinful nature. It was not necessary that he should. On the other hand it was necessary and proper that he should not. He entered the sphere of human life as Adam did. But some one may say that Adam was peccable, and therefore Christ must also be. We answer that Adam had the power not to sin (*posse non peccare*), and had he believed God and continued in his fellowship he would have become so confirmed in righteousness that it would have become, if not a metaphysical yet, a moral impossibility to sin. He would not have been able to sin (*non posse peccare*). His whole soul would have revolted at the thought of sin and he would have said to the tempter, "Get thee behind me Satan; thou art a stumbling block unto me: for thou mindest not the things of God." It is not the privilege of any one to sin. It is only the abuse of a God-given power.

Jesus began his earthly career in exactly that condition in which it was Adam's privilege to be—a state of confirmed holiness, in which the will is so entirely in harmony with truth that it can not sin. We might as well say that God is not free because he can not lie, as to say that Christ must have been in a condition in which he could have chosen sin.

It may be said that though Christ was God's Son that "he emptied himself, taking the form of a servant," Phil. 2:7, and that his self-limitations extended to his knowledge of future events, e. g., the time of the judgment. Whatever may be included in the idea of the self-limitation (*kenosis*) we may be sure that it pertained rather to the lowly estate in which he

lived than in a surrender of any essential attribute. He certainly did not cease to exercise the functions of the divine moral attributes of holiness, love, truth and justice. There is no record that he was ever deceived by man or Satan. His moral nature was so sensitive that the atmosphere of sin was oppressive to him. He detected wrong instantly. He exposed and denounced it often even before it came to open expression.

Christ's human nature apart from his divine nature, if we may separate them, might be considered peccable. If it had not been enlightened and sanctified by the latter, he might have fallen. But as a fact these natures are not separated or even separable. They constitute the God-man. The weaker is strengthened by the stronger, so that it is brought into complete harmony with it. Thus we speak of Christ as having one will or two wills. When we say that he possessed one will, we mean that his human will so coalesces or blends with the divine that practically there is but one will. To hold that Christ was peccable would be to maintain that his weaker nature was more powerful than his stronger! It would mean that the eternal Logos could fall in the person of Jesus Christ. This *reductio ad absurdum* seems to us to refute unanswerably the idea of the peccability of our Lord.

Moreover, to deny his impeccability is to deny him the possession of certain attributes which he undoubtedly frequently exercised, e. g., omnipotence. He calmed the raging sea; he raised the dead; he cast out demons. No power short of the divine could have conquered him or caused him to do wrong. To think otherwise would be to make Satan omnipotent and Christ impotent. Now, surely God tempts no man except in the sense of trying him, and he therefore could not tempt Christ. Satan is not omnipotent and hence inferior to Christ. His omnipotence made him invulnerable to the attacks of a creature.

We may argue in like manner concerning his wisdom. His intelligence was infinite. He could not be deceived by a finite being such as Satan is. He knew the author of sin, and well understood all the consequences of transgression. It is unthinkable that an infinitely wise Being could fall a prey to the cunning of an impostor.

We affirm also that his holiness, which sums up his ethical per-

fection, is contradicted by the idea of peccability. This latter would rob it of its very essence and deprive him of his essential character as divine. He would no longer be to us an example and model, for there would be in him an inherent weakness and liability to fall. In short, to ascribe ability to sin to Christ would be to dethrone him. He would not have been God, for God can not sin, because he can not contradict his own nature.

Let us now consider the chief objection that is made to Christ's impeccability. Schaff in his treatise on "The Person of Christ" says, "Had he been endowed from the start with *absolute* impeccability, or with the impossibility of sinning, he could not be a true man. * * * As a true man Christ must have been a free and responsible moral agent: freedom implies the power of choice between good and evil." Hodge (Syst. Theology ii, 457) writes in a similar strain, "This sinlessness of our Lord, however, does not amount to absolute impeccability. * * If he was a true man he must have been capable of sinning. * * Temptation implies the possibility of sin. If from the constitution of his person it was impossible for Christ to sin, then his temptation was unreal and without effect, and he cannot sympathize with his people."

The keynote of the objection is voiced in the statement, "Temptation implies the possibility of sinning. If this be not true then Christ's temptation was unreal."

There can be no doubt as to the reality of Christ's temptations. It is plainly declared over and over again that he was tempted. The Scriptures depict him as struggling against the tempter in the wilderness and in the garden and elsewhere. He was tempted in all points like as we are "yet without sin," Heb. 4:15.

We hold, therefore, both to the reality of Christ's temptation and to his impeccability. And we maintain that they are not irreconcilable. Having offered, what seems to us, ample proof of Christ's impeccability, it remains for us to show that the proposition that "temptation implies the possibility of sinning" is utterly untenable.

It has been well said by Shedd (Dogmatic Theology ii, 336) in answer to the statement that impeccability is inconsistent with temptability: "This is not correct; any more than it would be correct to say that because an army cannot be conquered, it cannot be attacked. Temptability depends upon the constitutional *susceptibility*, while impeccability depends upon the *will*. So far as his natural susceptibility, both physical and mental, was concerned, Jesus Christ was open to all forms of human temptation excepting those that spring out of lust, or corruption of nature. But his peccability, or the possibility of being overcome by these temptations, would depend upon the amount of voluntary resistance which he was able to bring to bear against them. Those temptations were very strong, but if the self-determination of his holy will was stronger than they, then they could not induce him to sin, and he would be impeccable. And yet plainly he would be temptable."

It is necessary in this contention to consider the meaning of "temptation." The word in Greek, in Hebrew and in English signifies "trial" or "testing." To tempt is "to try" or "to prove." The motive of the trial may be either good or evil. God tries or tests his children to prove or to improve them. He never tempts man to sin. Satan tempts men in order to overthrow them. There is nothing in the word or idea of temptation that necessarily implies liability to sin. That liability to sin may ordinarily be present with temptation, we will not deny; but we cannot concede that such liability can be predicated of a perfect Being. Liability to fall decreases in proportion to a man's nearness to perfection and to God and necessarily becomes *nil* in a divine or perfect man.

The possession of free-will does not imply liability to fall, and only in a certain sense possibility of falling. For in proportion as it is really free and joined with the exercise of unerring intelligence does free-will choose the right. It is only the blinded, perverted and bound will that chooses wrong. It is a moral impossibility for a will that is truly free to choose evil with a full realization of its character and its consequences.

If it be asked why Satan tempted Christ when he must have known that he was invulnerable, we would answer *first* that Satan may not have known that a God-man was invincible. It

was his first trial with a Being of that kind. Moreover, Satan is by no means omniscient. In fact he is a fool, as all sinners are in the long run. We would answer *secondly* that it is the province of Satan to vex and to inflict pain and sorrow. A wicked man may do injury to a good man and harrow his soul without in the least causing him to sin. No doubt Christ suffered being tempted (Heb 2:18), but he did not suffer in the loss of purity or holiness. There is no doubt that he remained sinless in spite of all that Satan could do.

If Christ was impeccable, how could he be tempted at all? Remembering the definition of temptation we can see how this was possible. He was human and possessed the faculties and senses to which temptation appeals. He could be tempted by natural and innocent appetite. He could be oppressed by toil. He was tempted by the malice of his foes as well as by the folly and unkindness of professed friends. He was capable of mental anguish. He suffered more intensely than other men because of his perfect organization. His conflicts were terribly real for it was only "with strong crying and tears" that he came out as conqueror. When it said that he was made perfect through suffering, the perfection referred to was not that of moral character but of fitness for the work of a Mediator.

It is important also to recall the kind of temptations through which the Saviour passed. It is said of him that he "hath been in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin," Heb. 4:15. Notice the important limitation, "without sin." The signification of the passage is not that he was not overthrown or that he came through the temptation without sinning. Exegetically it means that there was no sin in him, that he had not "one single sinful emotion" or "a single slumbering element of sin" (Lange). He had no disordered affections or inward propensity to sin, or any illicit desire. Hence he had none of the weaknesses of a fallen man and no temptations arising from a perverted mind.

The temptations which Christians endure are after all chiefly those which arise from disappointment, bereavement, sickness, pain, indifference of friends and opposition of foes, weariness, sorrow and the like. Whatever may be the nature of their trouble Christ knows it.

If Christ did not personally experience all temptations and was not capable of sinning, can he yet sympathize with the poor, weak mortals who fall into all sorts of sins? He certainly does. It is not necessary for a man to be a drunkard or even to have an appetite for intoxicants that he may have the sincerest sympathy for a poor drunkard. A saintly woman may have the deepest sympathy for the fallen, without ever having been tempted as they are.

No one will for a moment dispute the deep and tender love of our Lord for all classes of people. He ate and drank with publicans and with sinners. He freely forgave the penitent. He invited the laboring and heavy laden to accept him because he could sympathize with them being meek and lowly in heart. We may be sure that in sharing our lot and feeling our sorrow and humbling himself even to death for us, he was really tempted and tried, and that he came through the fiery trial pure gold because there was no dross in him.

ARTICLE XI.

SPENER AND HIS INFLUENCE.

BY REV. HENRY ANSTADT, A.M.

The birth of Protestant Christianity in the sixteenth century is undoubtedly the most interesting and important chapter of Reformation history. But the book is not complete in its first chapter. Next in importance to the birth of Protestantism is that great movement of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries known as the Pietistic movement. Its influence, too, has made itself felt throughout the Christian world.

That we may best understand its cause and importance, it will be necessary to look at the condition of the German Church, out of which the movement sprang. The country had just passed through the terrible experiences of a long and cruel war with all its demoralizing effects. The Thirty Years' War was the last great combat between Protestantism and Catholicism in Europe. Perhaps the most terrible in all history, it left the country in a most deplorable condition. Our own late Civil War, lasting only a few years, cost a great sacrifice of life and property, and had a very depressing effect upon the morals and religion of the country. If that was demoralizing, what must have been the effect of the Thirty Years' War, which reduced the population of Germany from 30,000,000 to 12,000,000, completely destroyed large and flourishing cities, and swept out of existence many trades and industries! But more than this, the war had barbarized the German people and left a legacy of misery and hate. For a life-time men had been engaged in war, and the education of their children had of necessity been neglected. Moral law was disregarded. "God, worship, religion, became a tradition. In character, in intelligence, and in morality, the German people had been set back two hundred years."

And within the Church itself the condition of things was far from being good. A general review of church history shows that every very important movement has been followed by a rest, and finally by a reaction. It was so with the Reformation.

In opposing the Romish doctrine of works, it became necessary to emphasize the doctrine of "Justification by Faith." And the reformers joined with this faith a pure life as its natural fruit. When the Pope was no longer accepted as the only interpreter of the Bible, the Church was led to prepare new statements of Scripture teaching as foundations of Protestant doctrine. The Reformation period was a creed-making period. This, of course, was necessary and right. But men after a while came to put these church symbols on a par with, or even above the Bible in importance; and in their eagerness to acquire the most perfect orthodoxy, they destroyed the life of Christianity. They feasted the mind and starved the heart. It seems almost impossible that, so soon after the devoted labors of Luther and Melancthon to secure a pure Christianity, the Church should have gone back into a state of such coldness and indifference. The seventeenth century was a time of rigid orthodoxy, when the cold statements of the symbolical books were substituted for the warm, practical and saving truths of the gospel. In the translator's preface to Knapp's *Christian Theology* there is a paragraph describing the state of affairs in the Church at the time:

"Spener states that it was usual for persons to spend five or six years at the universities without hearing, or caring to hear, a single book, chapter, or verse of the Bible explained. In a few cases where exegetical lectures were commenced by such teachers as Olearius and Carpzov, they were soon abandoned. The Bible was perhaps less used before the time of Spener in Protestant universities than it had been, under penalty of excommunication, by pious Catholics before the Reformation. In place of the Scriptures, the different symbols established by the Protestant Church were taught and studied. The minutest distinctions established by them were contended for with the greatest zeal, and the least deviation from them was pronounced heresy as decidedly as if they had been given by inspiration of God, and was punished accordingly, with the greatest severity. The spirit of Protestantism seemed to have thrown off the hierarchal yoke, only to assume another and perhaps a more degrading form of bondage. In explaining and defending these symbols, the Aristotelian dialectics were employed, and in the use of them the students were thoroughly exercised. As to the practi-

cal effect which the doctrines of Christianity should have upon their own hearts, and the manner in which they should exhibit them for the benefit of others, nothing was said to them by their teachers. Thus disciplined, they went forth to repeat from the pulpit what they had learned at the university, and fought over their idle battles, in which their own learning and skill were often displayed, to the neglect of everything which might arouse the careless, persuade the doubting, or satisfy the deep desires and assuage the sorrows of the heart."

The Reformation union of the intellectual with the moral and religious was dissolved. The Protestant Church had lived a little over a century and was now all but spiritually dead. Think of the state of Germany at this time,—the country nearly ruined and people barbarized by a long war, and the Church almost buried in cold orthodoxy. The times call for a new reformation, or rather a regeneration, and the call is answered. Men often appear to be born to supply special needs, and so this age gave birth to one who by his earnest piety and spirituality fanned into a flame the few sparks of life that yet remained in the Christian Church.

Philip Jacob Spener was born January 13, 1635, in the town of Rappoltswiler in Upper Alsace. From his earliest youth circumstances conspired to train him for his important position of usefulness in the Church. He was always of a quiet, reflective nature, religiously inclined, and this disposition was nourished by congenial family influences. He had earnest Christian parents, who early instilled into him lessons of true piety. "He is justly regarded," says Dr A. Tholuck, "as belonging to that class, who have preserved, unimpaired from childhood, their baptismal grace; and, by uninterrupted internal development, continually made deeper progress in the life of faith." In addition to the pious examples in his own family, he acknowledges his indebtedness to the wholesome influence of a widowed countess of Rappoltstein, his god-mother, for the life and growth of his piety. When a boy of only thirteen years of age, his mind was so seriously impressed by her death, that there were awakened in his heart "the desire to depart with her from this world, and correspondent efforts, for a season, to extort from God his own dissolution, by means of prayer."

Although the Church had grown so cold in formalism, yet there had been even at this time a few men in whose lives the living fire of the gospel had shown. Among these men were John Arndt and Richard Baxter. Spener himself says that his earliest spiritual nourishment, outside of the Bible, was drawn from Arndt's *True Christianity* and Baxter's *The Saint's Everlasting Rest*. There was given to him also the advantage of special training and preparation for the university under a man of practical, pious spirit, his subsequent brother-in-law, Joachim Stoll, from 1645 chaplain to the Count of Rappoltstein. "To him under God am I indebted," says Spener, "for the first sparks of genuine Christianity, and proper motives in study; for encouragement and suitable advice, with reference to the improvement of the public discourses of God's house, for he taught me to confine myself closely to the text, and thence to learn the doctrines of the Christian religion."

His university studies were pursued first at Strassburg; and then, according to the custom of that time, he completed his education in attendance at different celebrated institutions of Europe. He was a student at Basle, then went to Tübingen, then to Freyburg, and spent a year at Geneva, and lastly went to Lyons in France. During his student life many of the influences thrown around him were such as to develop his natural piety. At Strassburg he studied under Dannhauer, Johann Schmid and Sebastian Schmid. These were pious men who had escaped the contagion of rigid Lutheranism, and Spener imbibed the spirit of these holy men. They helped to shape and mould his character. He was in the habit of speaking of the first of these, "a practical, zealous theologian of the strictest Lutheran school, as his *Preceptor*, with gratitude for his careful instruction in the doctrines of the pure Lutheran faith;" of the last, "as the most distinguished exegete of his day;" of John Schmid, however, that eminently worthy and Christian man, as his "Father in Christ." At Geneva, too, he was impressed by the piety and activity of the professors and ministers.

With such influences thrown around him from his youth up, it is no wonder that the very condition of the Church, in its deadness, served not to dampen his ardor, but rather to fire up

his pious energy in view of the great needs of the Church. In all his training he was being prepared for the great work that he accomplished.

Let us now look at his career. What were his activities that succeeded in warming the cold hearts of that time? He was by no means of a polemical disposition nor in any degree out of harmony with the doctrinal teachings of the Church. Even his enemies admitted his life to be blameless and his teaching to be orthodox. His concern was not so much with the doctrine as with the life of the Church. He came to the conviction that purity of doctrine and purity of life do not always go together. Impressed with the low condition of piety in the churches, the main object of his efforts seems to have been a regeneration of the spiritual life of the people. Let particular attention be paid to this, his motive principle, and how it directs all his work.

Spener's first field of labor was at Strassburg, where he preached for three years, and lectured at the university there. Then he was called to be senior or chief minister at Frankfort-on-the-Main. He labored there with great success for twenty years, when a call to become court preacher and member of the consistory at Dresden, usually regarded at that time as the highest ecclesiastical position in Germany, was extended to him. With varying encouragement and opposition he carried on his work of reform here for five years. The last, and perhaps the most pleasant years of his life, were spent in service at Berlin, where he received royal sympathy and support.

The character of the preaching in Germany at that time was not such as to inspire holy thoughts and pious living. The sermons were purely intellectual. Spener saw in this a reason for the deadness that was in the Church. As trees require not only the nourishment which the earth and clouds afford, but also the light and heat of the sun, so Christian living needs for its nourishment, not only the strength of doctrinal preaching, but also the warming and cheering influence of the Holy Spirit. Spener realized this and his first step toward reform was in preaching. His sermons, instead of being dry discussions of doctrinal points, were designed to improve the heart and life. With soundness of doctrine, he insisted on a change of the heart and holy living. "He endeavored to give to the preaching a more extended influ-

ence," says Tholuck, "than could be expected from the repeated use of the gospel pericopes, set apart for the morning service. The plan which he adopted for this purpose was this: he either explained a part of the Catechism, or subsequently connected passages of the Epistle found in it, and with the theme contained in the gospel pericope, also explained another text of Scripture, not found in the usual morning lesson. His design in this arrangement was to make the congregation thoroughly acquainted with the entire contents of the Holy Scriptures; whereas the chief object of the catechetical and homiletical practice of the preceding period had been *accurate knowledge of pure doctrine.*"

Spener sought to introduce a proper church discipline also. Catechetical instruction, which had been greatly neglected, he restored to its proper rank and importance as a means of grace. Confirmation at this time was entirely neglected in some of the churches, on the ground that baptism secured regeneration, and that confirmation implied an incompleteness of the grace and blessing bestowed by baptism. This ancient custom Spener reintroduced, recognizing that this mode of admission to all the church privileges, accompanied by a careful previous religious instruction, is eminently important in the preparation of members for a faithful performance of Christian duties.

We are surprised to learn that even in these mild measures he met with considerable opposition. But this fact only shows the spirit of the age, and convinced Spener of the necessity for greater activity on his part. He was led to introduce private and social meetings for the purpose of religious improvement. These meetings were at first held in his own house, but after twelve years from the time of their organization he was able to remove them to the church. The exercises in these meetings were of a devotional and edifying character. There were Scripture reading, singing, prayer, and religious conversation about the subject of the previous Sunday's sermon or some other subject of practical piety. In these meetings the congregation took part, and considered it both a privilege and a duty to participate in the services. The meetings were then called "*Collegia pietatis*:" in our day they would be called prayer-meetings.

In the midst of his busy pastoral and reform work, his literary activity was remarkable. More than one hundred volumes, be-

sides numberless pamphlets and tracts, came from his pen. One of these which most succinctly explains his religious attitude was his *Pia Desideria*, or Pious Wishes, which he wrote as a preface to an edition of Arndt's sermons issued in the year 1676. Beginning with the Lamentations of Jeremiah: "Oh that my head were waters," the author bewails the sad state of the Evangelical Church and proposes six remedies for its correction: "1. *The more extensive diffusion of the Word of God*, and private meetings for the purpose of making the people more thoroughly acquainted with the Scriptures; 2. *The introduction and diligent use of the Spiritual priesthood*, the co-operation of the laity with the clergy in the edification of others and especially their own households, and by union in prayer; 3. *The earnest exhortation, that the knowledge of Christianity is not sufficient, that the diligent practice of it must be superadded*; 4. *Proper conduct toward errorists and unbelievers*, polemics conducted with Christian charity, with the hearty desire not only to convince but also to improve the opposer; 5. *A mode of theological study*, in which theologians are seriously reminded, *that success depends no less upon a godly life, than diligence and study*; 6. *Another method of preaching*, in which the prominent lesson would be, that Christianity consists in the inner or new man, the soul of which is faith, and its evidence, the fruits of the life."

An important activity in which Spener was engaged needs to be mentioned. As his pious desires concerning the general education and theological instruction in particular were not realized in the other schools of Germany, he was interested and active in the establishment and management of the University of Halle. This was perhaps the most important work accomplished by him for the general welfare of the Church. Such institutions have always been and must continue to be great centers of influence. With a Theological Faculty composed of such men as Franke, Breithaupt, and Anton, men like-minded with Spener, and appointed through his instrumentality, Halle came to be the center of the great Pietistic movement.

It is hard to conceive the amount of good influence such an active and able man as Spener could exert. During his own life-time he had already succeeded in impressing his spirit upon a large part of the German people. Some idea of the extent of

his influence may be drawn from the fact that at the end of one year in which he had replied to 622 letters, 300 remained unanswered. From all over Germany came appeals to him for guidance, from men who were stirred by the new life. His preaching drew large and attentive audiences, and produced deep impressions upon the minds and hearts of his hearers. Few sermons have produced greater effect than the one preached by him while at Frankfort, on the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees. The whole community was thrown into excitement; and it is said that men and women ran through the streets wringing their hands and smiting their hearts and crying out, "What must we do to be saved?"

Although the Pietistic movement was carried to ridiculous and evil extremes by some of the pious fanatics who grew up with it, and Spener himself had to lament that his greatest cause for alarm came from his own friends, yet the good influence of this man's example and teaching was manifest in the holier lives of many of the people, in the growing interest in his prayer gatherings, and in the increased study of the Bible.

Spener died at Berlin February 5, 1705, but his influence lives even to-day, and to a considerable extent in our own country. Many in our day who boast of their religious privileges would do well to remember that much of our boasted modern activity in religious service and duty may be traced to the efforts of that pious man. Many have been the influences that have gone out from the university at Halle which Spener was instrumental in founding. The very first missionaries of modern times were educated there; the first Bible Society was formed there; and this university may be looked upon as the parent of all the tract societies of America and England.

And we must not forget our own direct relation as Lutherans to this Pietistic movement. We are indebted to the school at Halle for our first laborers in Lutheranism in America. Muhlenberg, together with many of his co-laborers and successors here, as Kurtz, Schmidt, Kunze, and others, were trained in this school at Halle and brought with them its spirit and life. We have reason to be thankful that Spener lived and labored, and still lives in many of the activities that are most useful in the

Church to-day. The lesson of his life is, that a true Christianity consists, not in purity of doctrine alone, not in the cultivation of the intellect, not in empty formalism, but in a faith that is warmed by the spirit of love, and manifested by holy, pious living.

ARTICLE XII.

REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, NEW YORK.

The Creed of Jesus. By Henry Sloan Coffin, D.D., Pastor of the Madison Avenue Presbyterian Church and Lecturer in Union Theological Seminary, New York. Pp. 280. Price \$1.00. 1907.

This choice volume of sermonic literature is hailed as a welcome contribution from the gifted pen of a scholarly writer and thoughtful preacher. It deserves, and doubtless, will receive the wide recognition and reading which such a volume must compel.

From the very beginning a high note is struck and maintained to the end. Thomas Guthrie's three Ps are in evidence—painting, proving and persuading. "Sermons," it has been said, often part with their potency in passing through the printing press. In this volume, however, we find no illustration of such a theory. Forceful and persuasive in their delivery before an attentive Metropolitan Congregation, these twelve discourses are, further, destined to enrich and edify an eager multitude beyond the range of the original speaker's voice.

The opening message furnishes the attractive volume with its caption. Other themes that follow are: "Self-consciousness," "God's Sympathy," "Faith and Knowledge," "The Fundamental Message of Easter," "Our Limitations," "Heaven's Door through the Usual," "Christ as Suffering Saviour," "Cramped Lives," "The Attitude of Jesus Toward Nature," "The Unwearying Christ."

In the treatment of these subjects of perennial profit we admirably trace the skill and charm of a tactful *teacher*—an original thinker. His earnestness enkindles that of the reader, and grants a mutual reward. He magnifies his office, and thus wins both attention and assent to the sacred truth that shines in the brilliance of its own light. The train of thought presented under the theme of "Faith and Character" may provoke some controversy, but will contribute to a better understanding of the faith that won for Rahab a place in the Westminster Abbey of the Old Testament Worthies, as recorded in the Eleventh of Hebrews.

"Our Limitations" will bring many a worn and discouraged

pilgrim and toiler rare comfort, which will be a veritable fountain in the desert.

We predict a cherished place for this volume in an age when the golden grain becomes more conspicuous because of the multitudinous chaff.

C. REINWALD.

Epochs in the Life of Jesus. By A. T. Robertson, M.A., D.D., Professor of New Testament Interpretation in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky. 1907. Pp. 190. Price \$1.00 net

To present a "Study of development and struggle in the Messiah's Work" is the avowed aim of the author. The eight chapters which make up the volume form the substance of a series of popular lectures delivered by the learned Doctor at a Summer Chautauqua in the state of Missouri. In response to an earnest request from a large body of ministers and other Christian workmen, these lectures appear in attractive and permanent form available for the library and the home

"Epochs in the Life of Christ" is an inexhaustible theme. Every age rehearses the story and rejoices in the message that most worthily expresses the Christ of the Scriptures. To quote the language of Dr. G. C. Lorimer: "It reveals a character of greater massiveness than the hills, of serener beauty than the stars, of sweeter fragrance than the flowers; higher than the heavens in sublimity, and deeper than the seas in mystery."

Our author exhibits a genuine love for his work in portraying the career of Christ. His absorbing interest is at once communicated to the reader. The stirring scenes of Palestine are made to live again, but above all the Messiah is central and commanding.

The prayer of the ancient Greeks: "Sir, we would see Jesus" seemed to control and sustain the endeavor which has enriched religious literature with the volume before us.

Distinct turning points in the Life of Christ are designed to be brought out sharply under the discussion of the chapters, thus designated:

"The Messianic Concessions of Jesus," "The First Appeal of Jesus," "The New Departure," "The Galilean Campaign," "The Special Training of the Twelve," "The Attack Upon Jerusalem," "The Answer of Jerusalem," "The Final Triumph of Jesus."

Movement and vividness characterize the style of the writer. His sentences are principally terse and graphic. Brief open pictures of the apostles abide in memory with easy effort. Note

these examples: Simon Peter was versatile and alert. Andrew was a man of counsel. Thomas was cautious. Levi was a man of methodical business habits. Simon was a zealot. Judas had his opportunity, poorly as he used it.

In a book containing so much to commend, it is with no slight regret, that we find some sentences hastily constructed and obscure in sense; and also occasional statements, supported by inference rather than by evidence. As a specimen of the former we refer to page 36, in the third line: "He came to earth at all to die for sinners."

An example of the latter: We read on page 49, "*Christianity is spirit and Judaism is form.*" The fling at Judaism is undeserved.

We recall a truer statement on this point. The author was a wise and discriminating interpreter of both the Old Testament and the New, viz: Rev. J. A. Seiss, D.D., LL.D., of Philadelphia. In a lecture in the Gettysburg Seminary on "Christian Worship," he said: "Judaism is the cradle and chrysalis of Christianity."

C. REINERWALD.

Canon and Text of the New Testament. By Caspar Rene Gregory.

This book belongs to the *International Theological Library* series edited by Drs. Briggs and Salmond. In our judgment this is one of the most learned and useful of the series. The author shows familiar acquaintance with the sources of information. He does not theorize nor speculate. He draws conclusions from facts. He writes with a definite design. His style is easy and animated. His story of the Canon and of the Text often illustrates the adage that truth is stranger than fiction.

After a felicitous introduction, which discusses the word *Canon*, the *Jewish Canon*, *Intercommunication in the Roman Empire*, *Bookmaking of Old*, *What We Seek*, the author proceeds to discuss the *Canon* in the Apostolic Age: 33-90; The Post-Apostolic Age: 90-160; The Age of Irenaeus: 160-200; The Age of Origen: 200-300; The Age of Eusebius: 300-370; The Age of Theodore of Mopsuestia: 370-700.

Paul wrote the first books contained in the New Testament, as Thessalonians, Corinthians, Romans, Galatians. Matthew wrote his Gospel about the year A. D., 64, which is about the time "Paul stopped preaching and stopped writing, and went to heaven." Mark's Gospel was written about the year 69. Luke wrote his Gospel a little later. "It was not till nearly the end of the century that the Fourth Gospel appeared." The author shows that the Gospels came to authority in the Church only

gradually. They were not addressed to particular churches as many of the Epistles were. The Johannean problem is discussed at length. By internal and by external evidence the author makes out a strong case in favor of the Johannean authorship of the Fourth Gospel. At a very early period the Christians accepted this book, and they must have had good authority for the view that it is closely connected with the Apostle John, p. 183. Of course it is not the view of the author that the books of the New Testament were collected into one volume by direct action or order of God; but the Church, illumined by the Spirit of God, gradually brought together those books which the churches had received from apostles, and which otherwise came well authenticated. He rejects the theory—wisely—that “God caused these words to be written, and that by a positive necessity of the events he then took care that they should be gathered into the one collection. This theory is a beautiful theory, and it has been a comfort to many a Christian. But it fails to agree with what really took place. We see by turning back the pages of the years that God simply did not, in the way supposed, have the books collected. We say: Man proposes, God disposes. We might here say: Man imagines, God did. I believe that God watched over every step in the paths of the early Christians, but he had no thought of this theory of inspiration and of the canon. * * * God saw to it that the early Christians, through all the vicissitudes of their early fortunes and in spite of all their own weakness and fallibility, got the truth and passed it along to others.” This theory of inspiration and of the transmission of the Canon is supported by facts, whereas the old theory of a verbal inspiration that extends to the Hebrew vowel points and to the accents of the Greek, has absolutely nothing to sustain it. We close this part of our review by saying that we believe this to be the surest and the safest book on the canon in the English language.

The second part of Dr. Gregory's book, pp. 279-528, treats the Text of the New Testament. We recall that fifteen years ago the venerable Dr. Luthardt said to us: “Among textual critics, Dr. Gregory is first.” Since that time other critics have loomed into prominence, as Blass of Halle (now deceased), Nestle of Maulbron, Harris of Cambridge, and the science of textual criticism has been steadily advancing. Dr. Gregory has undoubtedly kept pace with others; but as there are so many questions connected with the ages of the different MSS. and their characteristics, that have been not yet settled, it is not to be supposed that Dr. Gregory has said the final word, or that his contemporaries will agree with all his propositions and conclusions. However, we are sure that Dr. Gregory has in this book

exhibited all the essential facts. His discussion of the preparation of the papyrus, and of the skins of beasts (parchments), for the reception of written matter, is full of interest and of information. He exhibits the sources of our present N. T. text in the order of their value, as the Uncial Manuscripts, the Cursives, the Lesson Books, Translations, the Church Writers and the Printed Editions. The externals of the text and the history of the text receive important consideration. Taking the sources individually they do indeed show a great amount of variation. But most of the variations can be satisfactorily explained when the sources themselves are intelligently studied. When the sources are compared it is in most cases easy to determine the true text. The multitude of sources is really a great boon, so that the Text of the N. T. is not a thing of uncertainty, but a thing of almost absolute certainty. Our author quotes Dr. Hort as saying that the substantial variations "can hardly form more than a thousandth part of the entire text." Of these variations not one overthrows a single fundamental doctrine as supposed to be contained in the *Textus Receptus*. Textual Criticism aims to give us the best Text. We commend this book with great heartiness.

J. W. RICHARD.

The History of Babylonia and Assyria. By Hugo Winckler, Ph.D., Professor in the University of Berlin. Translated and edited by James Alexander Craig, Ph.D., Professor of Semitic Languages and Literatures in the University of Michigan. Revised by the author. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1907. Pp. xii, 352. Price \$1.50 net.)

Prof. Winckler is one of our foremost Semitic linguists and specialists in Assyriology. Sixteen years have passed since he gave to the world his popular *Geschichte Babyloniens und Assyriens* which tersely stated the result of his researches laid down and scientifically corroborated in previous works. It was at that time charged with operating too much with doubtful or rash hypotheses. The rapid progress of Oriental research soon called for a revision. This appeared in 1899 as a contribution to Helmholt's *Weltgeschichte*. It is this version, translated and edited by Prof. Craig, which lies before us. He expresses the hope that it may be found more adequately to meet the wants of the growing body of students in our colleges and theological seminaries, "who perceive the almost unique importance of this study in relation to our knowledge of the history of civilization, its culture, art, and religion."

Dr. Jeremias in Leipzig, a pupil of Winckler, states that the

student of Biblical philology will find to-day in the various libraries of cuneiform inscriptions a literature which is twenty times as large as that which is offered in the Old Testament, and this in language as closely related to Hebrew as is Dutch to German. Such a condition naturally invites a comparison of the two literatures and the religions that they represent. But in determining the relation of Oriental excavations to Biblical scholarship a double injustice may be, and has been, committed: first by overestimating the importance of the excavations for the corroboration of Bible history; secondly by using the extra-Biblical data against the Bible itself. When George Smith, in 1872, deciphered the first portion of the Babylonian version of the deluge, the pulpits in England were filled with joy and astonishment. And the Catholic order of S. J. sent a scholar to England to copy the tablet before a possible enemy of the Bible might contrive to tamper with the inscription. Even in a land of scholars like Germany, sensations of this kind have not been wanting. The religious press, in matters sensational, shows often no more prudence than does the secular. Some years ago, when a palace was being excavated in Babylonia, the press served the notice that the wall was now dug out on which Belshazzar had seen the hand-writing: *mene, mene, tekel, upharsin*. The discovery of the name of Abram on a simple contract occasioned another announcement, viz, that the personal existence of Abraham had finally been established by the cuneiform inscription of a tablet. Little wonder that the reaction set in. In 1873, a student of Oriental archaeology, himself no dilettante, attempted, in a literary review, to sweep away a scientific fact (a surprising but real agreement between some Bible accounts and cuneiform inscriptions) with the provoking remark that the deciphering of the inscriptions could not be regarded as successful on account of their too striking resemblance to the corresponding narratives in the Bible. And recently, as Dr. Jeremias goes on to say, it seemed as if the wedged-shaped letters were to enter into the service of a destructive Biblical criticism. He alludes to the recent lecture of Fr. Delitzsch, which stirred Germany from hut to palace. Not that there was anything new in it. The scholars could hear it calmly. But they were, as many of the laymen were not, able to discern truth and fiction. He overstepped his bounds as a philologist and sinned against the historian and the theologian by making the Old Testament literature dependent on the Babylonian where nothing but mere analogies exist. A heated controversy was the result. It closed by putting an end to the "Babylonish captivity" of the Bible.

Though the lectures of Prof. Delitzsch defeated the author's prime purpose, they gained for him the credit of directing the

attention of the Christian world at large to close relation between Israel and Babylonia. This may prove to be of some significance in removing the landmarks of an arbitrary Old Testament criticism.

Should they be removed? For many years we have been suffering under the Wellhausen-Stade theory of Israelitish religion and history. It proclaims that the ideal religion of Israel began with the "writing" prophets, especially with Amos. The Biblical documents have been under its scissors time and again. What not has been declared legend, myth, immorality, and superstition! Woe to the one that dared dissent. Dissent meant to be stamped as an ignoramus in historical criticism. And yet the arbitrariness of Old Testament scholars would have been ruled out time and again if it had entered into the arena of historical criticism as applied in the field where the Germans, for patience and accuracy of scholarship, cannot be approached: the middle ages. Imagine a Wellhausen editing the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, or writing Hauck's *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*! The Wellhausen school has no doubt seen its best days; it has nothing new to offer. At the best it reproduces what is growing stale. In 1897 Prof. Fr. Hommel (conservative) struck some telling blows at this school of radicals. In 1899 Winckler picked to pieces Stade's *Rektoratsrede* "*Die Entstehung des Volkes Israels*." Things began to move at such a rapid rate that Baentsch, in 1906, himself a supporter of Wellhausen, called for a speedy revision of his master's theory.

Leaving the conservative scholars to take care of themselves, we shall indicate what the theory of Wellhausen has to expect from that of Winckler. Winckler's theory is called the pan-Babylonian: Babylonia being the oldest and most influential power in antiquity, all ancient history, including the history of Israel, must be studied from the standpoint of Babylonian civilization. The old scheme of animism, polytheism, henotheism, monotheism is useless. It explains nothing. The solution lies in the astral religion. "The moon, sun and stars are the central object around which it turns....The stellar world was....only the supremest revelation in which the governance and purpose of the gods could be most plainly observed." Saul, David, Solomon accordingly are lunar heroes; their name, life, and deeds must be comprehended in the light of astral science. They may be historical, or not historical, persons. Monotheism is a product of Israel's religious thinking. Thus far, Winckler.

Winckler's theory has been hailed as the demolisher of Wellhausen's. At first blush the one appears as sensible as the other. One thing is certain: it cannot be ignored. When the new theory will have had as long a lease of life as the old theory has had,

certainly some landmarks will have been removed—perhaps, back to the places where they originally belonged. We can afford to await the results. It seems, though, as if the Winckler theory, as modified by the brilliant university-docent Dr. Jeremias, will serve the positive school in more ways than one. He rejects the time-worn notions about myths and legends. "The primitive stories in the Bible are not *Sagen*, not myths; they are in the conception of their age a reproduction of Oriental science concerning the origin and development of the world. But the science is not an aim in itself, it is a means to an end, being placed in the service of religious conviction."

Some claim that the Winckler theory is more destructive to the Bible than is the Wellhausen. Both are, of course, uncomfortably speculative. But the former as maintained by Dr. Jeremias is by far the more reverential to the Bible. The Leipzig scholar in comparing the literature of Babylonia with that of the Bible shows a marked preference for the authenticity of the latter.

Winckler's ideas concerning the religion of Israel will have to be learned from other books than the "History of Babylonia and Assyria." But the perusal of this one will be of much aid in forming an estimate of the author's thorough knowledge of the ancient kingdoms and empires. The work has a very good map and one of the most complete indexes that it can fall to the lot of a book on history to have. Indeed, it seems as if the editor's heaviest contribution to the work consists in the index. We thank him no less for it than for the translation.

JOHN O. EVJEN.

A Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels. Edited by James Hastings, D.D., with the assistance of John A. Selbie, D.D., and (in the reading of the proof) of John C. Lambert, D.D. Vol. ii. Labor-Lion. Appendix and Indexes. Pp. xiv. 912.

Price per volume, in cloth \$6.00; in half-morocco \$8.00. Sold by subscription only and in sets of both volumes.

This second and concluding volume of *A Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels* sustains the high reputation for scholarship and evangelical spirit, established by the first volume. Our personal and constant use of the *Dictionary* enables us to commend it to all students of Christ and the Gospels. We have found little to condemn and much to praise from an ethical, religious and scientific point of view. We have here the latest and the best from the pens of about two hundred leading Biblical scholars of the world.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

MACMILLAN COMPANY, NEW YORK.

The Inward Light. By H. Fielding Hall. Price \$1.75.

This book is an attempt to express in the terms of evolution the Buddhist faith of India, the land of its birth. As such, in the nature of the case, it is both in form and in matter a rather dismal failure. It is about as great a piece of absurdity as it was in the founder of the Arya Somaj to attempt to express old Hinduism in such a way as to set up for it the claim for that hoary faith, that it contained all the germs of modern science.

Generally speaking, the author is correct in his contention that Buddhism is not a departure from essential Hinduism, but only a rebound from the priestcraft of the Brahmin. But this will not explain it, as he goes on to show. It is a large claim that the author makes for a most ignorant Buddhist priesthood and the practical piety of the 'prayer-wheel', and we only wonder how he can draw his conclusions. But he soon shows his hand and the reason for the book in his attack on that form of Christianity of which he seems to have a knowledge.

There is not much of a story in the book, though perhaps enough to make it popular. A European traveller meets with an accident in Burma, and, by the fall of his horse, has his leg broken. Cared for by the monks of the Buddhist monastery, he learns there the faith of the Buddha. He remains until he has drained the last drop of the honey of that great faith! From monk and from people, he is represented as gathering all that man needs for his highest development, which has been realized nowhere else as in Burma.

This faith he admits was driven out of India, but he will not take it amiss if others do not follow his explanations of the reasons for its failure in the land of its birth.

The Eastern setting of the book is rather feebly drawn. The author betrays himself by Western forms of expression, when his monk speaks, as well as by thought that is not at all Eastern. He has his infelicitous conceptions of the East, which any one recognizes who has lived there any length of time.

Philosophically, he shows himself the veriest pantheist and so identifies himself with nature as to commit himself to the expression, Hindu rather than Buddhist, that nature is god and god is nature. We need hardly say that his views of what the Buddha believed are more or less of his own fancy. This great saint of 2500 years ago held to one truth most persistently, viz, work out your own salvation. The author to maintain a seeming consistency must have his fling at personality, its necessary correlated truth, human accountability; and in working out his

ideas has his fling at the conception of a religion that has as a goal a heaven and hell.

But the book is a subtle attack on Revelation and Christianity. It confuses the whole question of good and evil and on page 138 boldly asserts that 'good and evil are both from God and there is no Devil—only another face of God.' In short the book is a mix-up of oriental thought, Hindu and Buddhist, more the former than the latter.

The keynote of the book is found in the phrase 'ray of life' and all nature and all truth as seen in nature must be found in the sum of these rays. But while the author fails to set forth essential Buddhism, he has an aim in view that comes clearly to the surface, a skillfully veiled and subtle attack on Christianity. It deserves its place on the Index of Rome and merits being pilloried by every Protestant.

It is claimed by the author that he has been set the task of reconciling the East and the West, both in thought and life. The style of the book and its method of thought reveal an attempt on the part of the writer to show how it can be done. The chapter on 'all truth is one' shows us how this union of these two domains of thought is to be effected, viz, by accepting a thorough-going pantheism. The plan has been attempted by Dr. Parker's successor in his work.

Men who have made the thought and life of the East a life-study have not succeeded as yet, but now it is going to be done by this new star that has arisen!

Science and religion occupy two separate spheres of work, the former may be helpful to the latter, but its form and method can never set aside the latter.

The style of the book is good and deserves a better subject. The publisher's letter-press as is to be expected, leaves little to be desired.

This book, let us remark as a final word, is the kind of pabulum on which the Theosophical Society feeds, that attempt to be Buddhistic in lands where the faith of the Buddha exists and Hindu in the land of the Vedas and anything else in the land where any other faith is found.

L. B. WOLF.

The Christ that is to be. By the author of "Pro Christo et Ecclesia." (New York. 1907. Pp. xvii, 385. Price \$1.50 net.)

The author states in the preface that his book "is only a series of successive efforts to write what the Gospel of Jesus really is. Each line of thought is unfinished and there is very much in what

is said that in a mature work would be more carefully guarded from misconstruction. These fragments are only published in the hope that those who have greater opportunity may find in them something to refine and complete."

The work is divided into four books. The first book discusses our need of reformation, the vital age, faith, prayer, the place of the kingdom in the struggle to survive, salvation by joy. The second: the conflict of the physical and the moral, the use of sin and pain, fatalism and asceticism, prophets and apostles, irreverent eclecticism, dream of justice. The third: the devil and his angels, superstition, exorcism, mind and disease, faith and the doctors, history of health by faith, "the balance of nature," nature marvels, the conditions of physical power. The fourth: fasting and temptation, the protest of the parable, the fighting spirit, "the sword and the muckrake," the Protestantism of Jesus, the power of His death.

The author's standpoint seems to be liberal-conservative, with the accent on liberal, though the apologetic note is sounded very often. Modern Psychology is a most important auxiliary in his theology; rather too much deference is paid to it. The references are to French and English works, evidently due to the insular backwardness in getting acquainted with the language of the *Theologischer Jahresbericht*. We have too many fragments in the author's work—fragments possessing but little organic unity—to warrant the belief that his theoretical Christ will ever, or anywhere, be accepted as the Christ that is to be, differing from the Christ that has been.

J. O. EVJEN.

EATON AND MAINS, NEW YORK.

The Evolution of Love. By Emory Miller. Price \$1.50 net. 1907.

This book, of 355 pages, is put forth without an index—a neglect which decreases the value of any learned work to the student fifty per cent. at the least, in many cases almost destroys the book's usefulness entirely. The author tells us in the short Preface that a revised edition of the earlier work has been offered because of the many who "professed to have gained specific and long-needed help from the first edition," and because of the encouragement given by the appreciations of such readers as Gladstone, Iverach, Bowne, &c. We confess the Preface raises expectations which are disappointed in the reading of the volume—perhaps because the appreciations are made responsible for the "revised edition." The author tells us the original impulse from which the book proceeded was to answer to himself the question

"What must I think?"

The plan of the work gives it the form of an attempt to set forth a system of Christian Theology in frame of a system of philosophy. The purpose is to show, from the facts of mind's interaction with nature, that the great facts of Christian Theology logically follow. The conception and arrangement is excellent for its perspicuity. The whole work is divided into two parts.

Part One, "Implications of Being," is subdivided "Being, as perceived; Being, as conceived; Being, as conditioned." Our idea of Being is a perception in which the experiences of sensation, and consciousness are co-ordinated. If we proceed from the concept of Being abstractly we arrive at self-existence. But the perception holds a self-existent which is only itself. The self-existent is independent. I, therefore, am the self-existent. "But I find, as a matter of fact, I am not independent, and, therefore, am not self-existent." The implications of Being, as warranted by perception, are therefore individuality and dependence. The chapter closes with four propositions which the perception of Being implies:

"1. Perceived, dependent being unavoidably implies independent being.

2. Independent being is infinitely self-determining.

3. Self-determination is personality; and infinite self-determination is infinite personality.

4. Hence the perceived fact, my independent being, unavoidably implies the Infinite Person, God."

In chapter two he faces about. If perception gives such a conclusion as to Being, what or how shall such Being be conceived? In Platonic fashion he argues from the concept ideally.

"I. Perfect action, conscious and infinitely free, is the highest generation, the primary unit, the unconditioned nature of independent being.

II. Perfect action is perfectly intentional.

III. The nature of perfect action is perfect self-love, realizing a perfect ego.

IV. Self-love, by realizing perfect, that is, infinite, egoism, founds perfect, that is, limitless, altruism.

The second part of the book shows how the Being, so conceived, acting in accord with the conception of his inherent perfection, evolves the universe of history, Creation, Evil, Revelation, Atonement, Eschatology.

Evil cannot proceed, so argues the author, from Being as above conceived. Hence it arises from the free exercise of the dependent will in interaction with the independent or absolute will,

selfishly seeking to disturb the harmony of the whole. The first such disturber is called, "by bad preeminence, the Devil." The Devil which the author knows is intensely human so far as his 'evolution' goes. He attributes to him a "representative" capacity for evil. Then brushes aside the question as to whether this Devil inhabits this planet or not as irrelevant. The author's method leaves the way dangerously open to the theory that each individual begins his career under possibilities of perfect harmony with the absolute, but as a matter of fact in the evolution becomes devil. I say dangerously open.

"Love's devotement to the perfect" logically leads to the vicarious sacrifice of the Perfect for the imperfect. "This is the atoning fact."

The effect of sin is "self-limiting to personality," hence, in the future life it will result "in final extinction of the personal consciousness of the sinner."

"Those persons, who, by the faith which subjects the actual to the ideal life, have overcome their susceptibility to selfishness will have determined themselves in harmony with divine love to a degree which renders their companionship with God self-persistent."

The argument of Part One is *ad hominem*, a nice statement of a man's way of holding a creed, but without cogency beyond that. Part Two seems an attempt to hold the essentials of Christian Theology in a philosophic creed, but ends with nothing more than a social outcome of altruistic humanitarianism.

C. F. SANDERS.

A. C. ARMSTRONG & SON.

Positive Preaching and Modern Mind. By P. T. Forsythe, M.A., D.D. The Lyman Beecher Lectures on Preaching, Yale University, 1907.

We have read very many of *The Lyman Beecher Lectures on Preaching*. But we prefer these to all others that we have read. There is a tone of authority and a positiveness of conviction about them that are refreshing in this time of hesitancy and apologizing. We are in deepest sympathy with the very first utterances of this book: "With its preaching Christianity stands or falls." "In Protestantism preaching is the most distinctive feature of worship." "Preaching is the most distinctive institution in Christianity." "The only business of the apostolic preacher is to make men practically realize a world un-

seen and spirituality; he has to rouse them not against a common enemy but against themselves; not against natural obstacles, but against spiritual foes; and he has to call out not natural resources, but supernatural aids." This all sounds like Luther in his *Order of Divine Worship in the Congregation*. Undoubtedly the highest office in the Christian Church is that of preaching, and the most important part of every divine service is the preaching, that is, the authoritative and harmonious setting forth of the divine word. In the first chapter the author discusses *The Preacher and His Character*. In the second he treats *The Authority of the Preacher*. In *The Preacher and His Church or Preaching as Worship*, he shows that preaching is the great act of worship, that it is sacramental, that it mediates Christ, that it presents his finished work of redemption, that it is not only evangelizing, but that it also comprehends the inner community,—and from that reaches to the world without. The preacher's first need is a positive theology. He must preach the creed of his church. "A positive theology is an evangelical theology." But the old faith demands a re-interpretation of theology, it may be even a revision. A modernized theology is not incompatible with the old faith, but a liberal theology, in so far as it is negative, is fatal to the old faith. Preaching is to be emphatically a preaching of the Cross, the preaching a God of mercy rather than a God of love.

The book is not a work on Homiletics; it does not lay down and expound rules for the composition of a sermon; but it treats of the mind and heart and spirit and aim and message of the preacher. Hence it is more fundamental than a treatise on Homiletics. It opens a vision to the preacher and presents a spiritual ideal. It gives the young preacher an exalted conception of his calling; it will stimulate the experienced preacher in his work. It is because it deals with principles that the book will have an abiding value, and will take its place among the classics of homiletic literature. The book is so suggestive as to be of more value to the preacher than half a dozen volumes of *Sketches and Skeletons of Sermons*, for it is the spirit of the preacher, his ability to comprehend the needs of the people and to meet those needs with a positive Gospel interpreted in the language of the age—these are more important than introduction, and theme, and first, secondly, thirdly, finally, and "now the application." Get this book and read it from Alpha to Omega, as the writer hereof has done, and you will say what the Queen of Sheba said of the glory of Solomon.

J. W. RICHARD.

THE NEALE PUBLISHING COMPANY.

The Law and the Gospel of Labor. By Luther Hess Waring, M.A., (New York and Washington. 1907. Pp. 140. Price \$1.00.)

The contents of this booklet are divided into two parts. The first part treats of the Labor Union in relation to the law, to the militia, and to incorporation; and of the law as to strikes, boycotts, and injunctions. The second part, entitled *The Gospel of Labor*, or labor and Christianity, constitute about one-third of the book, which closes with St. Paul's psalm of love. The author, a Lutheran minister in Washington, D. C., has in this little work collected some interesting material on the topic in question. He supplements this by relating some of his personal observations of happenings in communities where strikes were the order of the day. He argues that the harm done by boycotts and strikes is much greater than the good resulting from them, and that the ethics of the Gospel, if properly lived up to, presents the only effective moral solution of the labor problem. The tone of the book is earnest.

J. O. EVJEN.

AMERICAN TRACT SOCIETY, NEW YORK.

The Lord of Glory. A Story of the Designations of Our Lord in the New Testament with especial reference to His Deity By Benjamin B. Warfield Professor in Princeton Theological Seminary. Cloth, 12 mo. Pp. xi, 332. \$1.50 net.

The name of Dr. Warfield is a sufficient guaranty of thorough workmanship, scholarship and evangelical purpose. The names and titles of our Lord in the New Testament are critically studied. The presentation of the subject, however, is so simple that any intelligent layman will have no difficulty in reading it with profit. We are amazed at the great variety of the designations of Christ, and impressed with the richness of their meaning and implications. The compass of the volume did not admit of following the latter to any extent. The matter is presented in such a clear manner that the conclusion must be inevitably drawn by the reader that the old faith is not a cunningly devised fable.

The book has great apologetic value as set forth in the concluding chapter on "The Issue of the Investigation." The designations are "charged with three specific convictions on the part

of the Christian community, to which they give endlessly repeated and endlessly varied expression. Christ is the Messiah; Christ is our Redeemer; Christ is God: These are the great asseverations which are especially embodied in them. All three are already summed up in the angelic announcement which was made to the shepherds at His birth: "I bring you good tidings of great joy which shall be to all the people: for there is born to you this day in the city of David the Saviour who is Christ the Lord." This announcement is the prelude and the keynote of the New Testament, and is the proof that the Christian community from the first was firmly convinced that Jesus Christ was God manifest in the flesh.

The study further establishes the fact that the early Christians derived their knowledge and convictions largely from the teachings of Christ himself. They believed that he was divine, and he confirmed their faith by the clearest personal claims. "As certain as it is that these two things are true, that the whole Christian community believed their Lord to be divine and that Jesus taught that he was divine, so certain it is that neither of them could be true if it were not true that our Lord was divine."

There must have been more than our Lord's bare assertion to convince men that he was divine. There must have been various attendant circumstances to confirm this claim. His power over his disciples and the general impression created demanded this. His life and works and character must have been consonant with his assertion. "We can understand how his followers could believe him divine, if in point of fact he not only asserted himself to be divine but lived as became a God, taught as befitted a divine Instructor, in all his conversation in the world manifested a perfection such as obviously was not human; and if dying, he rose again from the dead. If he did none of these things can their firm and passionate faith in his deity be established?"

We must not forget also that the then present and now world-wide influence of Jesus emanated from a young man of thirty, emerging from obscurity for the brief space of three years, living during those years under the scorn of the world and dying as a malefactor. This influence must have been grounded in something more than a mere claim. It can be accounted for only on the assumption of the authority of his divine deeds culminating in his resurrection from the dead, which is God's own seal upon the truth of his deity. "It is safe to say that apart from evidence so convincing the high claims of Jesus could not have been met with such firm and unquestioning faith by his followers. This very faith becomes thus a proof of the truth of his claims."

It is not supposable that Jesus made false claims. There have been many bad men who have made, and others who might make such claims. But is Jesus to be classed with vile impostors or deluded fanatics? "These are the alternatives: grossly deceiving; grossly deceived; or else neither deceiving or deceived, but speaking the words of soberness and truth." The world of thoughtful and good people has long since passed its verdict that Jesus was the rarest and noblest of Beings. The ultimate proof of "the deity of Christ is just—Jesus and Christianity."

J. A. SINGMASTER.

